

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO



3 1761 01442816 3



HISTORY  
OF THE  
CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

VOL. VI.

HENRY FROWDE, M.A.  
PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD  
LONDON, EDINBURGH  
NEW YORK



HISTORY  
OF THE  
CHURCH OF ENGLAND

FROM THE ABOLITION  
OF  
THE ROMAN JURISDICTION.

BY  
RICHARD WATSON DIXON, D.D.,  
LATE VICAR OF WARKWORTH,  
HONORARY CANON OF CARLISLE,  
AND HONORARY FELLOW OF PEMBROKE COLLEGE, OXFORD.

VOL. VI.

ELIZABETH.—A.D. 1564—1570.

54 508  
25/7/02

SEEN BY  
PRESERVATION  
SERVICES

OXFORD:  
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS.

DATE... JUN 10 1902

1902

[All rights reserved.]

BX  
5055  
D48  
1884  
v.6

OXFORD  
PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS  
BY HORACE HART, M.A.  
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

# CONTENTS

OF

## THE SIXTH VOLUME.

---

### CHAPTER XXXVI.

A. D. 1564.

	PAGE
Mistaken opinion that the extreme Evangelics now began to be called	
Puritans. They were Nonconformists. Meaning of the word . . .	1
Strength, and high position and expectations of the Nonconformists . . .	3
The word "religion" officially and properly used by Elizabeth to	
denote the alteration that was settled under her . . . . .	4
In that usage it referred to the public services of the Church . . .	5
Examples of Nonconformist variations from the alteration of religion	
which was accepted by the Conformists . . . . .	6
The Nonconformists no advocates of ignorance . . . . .	7
Position of the Nonconformist bishops . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Calhill preaches a violent sermon before the Queen . . . . .	8
The new Spanish ambassador, Guzman de Silva : his instructions . .	9
Philip wants to catch his own heretics who were fled to England . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Elizabeth entertains the Spaniard with the music of <i>The Battle of Pavia</i>	10
Elizabeth's memorable visit to Cambridge . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Her magnificent reception . . . . .	11
Perne's sermon in King's Chapel, Sunday, Aug. 5 . . . . .	12
In the evening a heathen play performed in the chapel . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Visit of the Court to the schools, Monday, Aug. 6 . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The chief scholastic display was at midday in the University Church	
of St. Mary . . . . .	13
The Queen makes the progress of the colleges, Aug. 9 . . . . .	14
Second disputation in St. Mary's . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The Queen addresses the University in Latin . . . . .	15
The theses that were disputed . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>

	PAGE
Performance of Thomas Cartwright, the Puritan . . . . .	16
Of Thomas Preston, whom the Queen prefers . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The new French ambassador, De Gonnorre . . . . .	18
His visit to Archbishop Parker, at Bekesbourne, in Kent . . . . .	19
He and the Bishop of Coutances ignorant of English affairs . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The bishop brought a French translation of the <i>Epistle of Osorius</i> to the Queen . . . . .	20
Nature of that performance, which had been published a year already, and answered by Haddon . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
It was probably the cause of the total ignorance of the English Church and Reformation which has ever since prevailed on the Continent . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Examination of it . . . . .	21
Examination of Haddon's answer . . . . .	23
Literary history of the controversy (note) . . . . .	26
The books of the Romanensians from abroad now begin to arrive . . . . .	27
One of them was Dorman's <i>Proof</i> , an attack on Jewel, which was answered by Nowell . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Horne and Bonner . . . . .	29
Bonner had been in the Marshalsea, in Winchester diocese, from 1560 . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The Oath now tendered him, for the first time under the new Statute, at Horne's house . . . . .	30
He refuses it . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
A certificate against him returned into King's Bench, in accordance with the new Statute . . . . .	31
He takes exception against this, and raises the question of the legal position of the new bishops . . . . .	32
His exceptions were not allowed by the judges to stop the case: but they thought that the issue whether Horne and the rest were bishops ought to go for trial by jury . . . . .	33
Bonner writes a vigorous denunciation of Horne . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Bonner writes the Queen a Latin letter . . . . .	34
He is secretly encouraged by the Spanish party . . . . .	35
The case suspended for two years . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
All this greatly encouraged the Romanensians . . . . .	36
Things still seemed hanging in the balance . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The cross still in the Queen's Chapel . . . . .	37
Death of the Emperor Ferdinand . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
His obsequies honourably performed in St. Paul's, but without prayer for his soul . . . . .	38
Confused state of the records of the beginnings of the Nonconformist struggle: of which no consistent account has yet been written . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Parker attempts a friendly accommodation with their leaders, Sampson and Humphrey, December . . . . .	39
He sends them ten questions: which they answer not as he would . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Other arguments pass between him and his assistants and them . . . . .	40
He then offers them a single Proposition, signed by himself and others of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners . . . . .	41

	PAGE
But some of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and other doctors added clauses to it before they would sign it . . . . .	41
The Proposition was signed by Sampson and Humphrey, and at the same time nulled by them . . . . .	42
Nature of the Nonconformist struggle . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>

## CHAPTER XXXVII.

A. D. 1565.

The beginning of the Nonconformist struggle . . . . .	44
The Queen sends Archbishop Parker a letter which forces him into action, January 25 . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Severe nature of that document . . . . .	45
Parker thereupon writes to the Bishop of London, and he to the other bishops of the province, to return to him certificates of disorder by the end of February . . . . .	46
The certificate of Christ Church in Canterbury, reporting favourably .	47
The only other certificate known to have been returned was from the University of Cambridge, reporting favourably . . . . .	48
But there is a document extant, which may be an abstract of other certificates, not favourable . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Meanwhile Parker and the other Commissioners for Ecclesiastical Causes draw up a set of Ordinances or Articles, for doctrine, ministration, and apparel, with a declaration of conformity to be subscribed, March 3 . . . . .	49
Examination of them as they were, probably, in the original draft .	50
They were greatly altered, it may have been by Cecil, who quickly returned them to Parker . . . . .	51
The alterations tended to lower their ecclesiastical tone, and almost took away their punitive character, and added no confirmation of them by the Queen . . . . .	52
The Archbishop sends them back in a fresh copy, perhaps containing the alterations: and expresses his disappointment that they were not confirmed, March 8 . . . . .	54
Meantime Parker had taken action: he summoned before him, and the rest of the Commissioners at Lambeth, Sampson and Humphrey again, with four others of the Nonconforming clergy of London, March 3 . . . . .	55
He tried in vain to get Cecil to be present . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
He examined them, March 8 . . . . .	56
Cecil attends a meeting of bishops, not to Parker's satisfaction .	<i>Ib.</i>
Dignified demeanour of the Oxford Nonconformist leaders, Sampson and Humphrey . . . . .	57
They address an eloquent supplication to Parker and the rest of the Commissioners, March 20 . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>



	PAGE
To Parker's disgust they are appointed to preach at Paul's Cross by the Earl of Leicester . . . . .	59
He resolves to proceed to deprive them : doubtful legality of this . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
He summons them again, and bids them conform or resign, April 29 . . .	60
Painful scene : distress of the Bishop of London . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Sampson deprived by a special order from the Queen . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Humphrey allowed to remain : his admirable letter to the Commissioners . .	61
Sampson was the first man deprived for Nonconformity . . . . .	62
His case obscure . . . . .	63
Parker showed him what kindness he could : but was probably wrong in depriving him : there was no ill will between them . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Their charitable letters to one another . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Parker's enquiries concerning licenses to preach . . . . .	65
George Withers and his antiquated license . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
This opens a fine nest both in Oxford and Cambridge . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Parker pursues his enquiries, and tries to get other bishops to revoke their licenses, without much effect . . . . .	66
Nonconformity in Cambridge . . . . .	67
The Vice-Chancellor, Beaumont, and other magnates protest to their Chancellor, Cecil, against compulsion, in anticipation, November 26 . . . . .	68
Cecil gives them a sharp answer . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Curious history of Nonconformity in St. John's College . . . . .	69
Longworth, the Master . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Fulk, one of the fellows, and preacher of the college . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Curious incidents . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Fulk and some of the other fellows sell all the copes . . . . .	71
Violent commotion in chapel, October 12 . . . . .	72
The Conformist fellows, headed by Coortesse, the President, accuse the Master and Fulk to Cecil . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Cecil summons them to London, but is not very severe . . . . .	73
He gives Longworth a retraction to read . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Longworth returns, and sends Cecil a friendly letter or two . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
He reads his retraction with divers omissions and insertions . . . . .	74
Coortesse informs Cecil of this, and sends a second set of accusations against Longworth . . . . .	75
Cecil, finding the disaffection spread in other houses, writes severely to Vice-Chancellor Beaumont, and refers the enquiry to Bishop Cox of Ely . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Cox makes searching enquiries in the colleges . . . . .	76
Cecil also appears to have referred the business to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Parker greatly dissatisfied with Cecil . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Bishop Bentham's Visitation of the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield . .	77
It exhibits many curious particulars . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
His Articles and Injunctions (note) . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Bishop Watson sent from Cox's custody to the Tower, January 9 . . .	81

Richard Creagh, titular Archbishop of Armagh, sent to the Tower,	
February 22 . . . . .	81
His case related . . . . .	82
There were other titular bishops in Ireland, appointed by the Pope .	83
Dean Nowell severely rebuked by the Queen when he preached	
before her, March 8 . . . . .	86
It was probably Marshal's <i>Treatise on the Cross</i> that Nowell attacked	
in his sermon . . . . .	87
Joy of the Romanensians . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>

## CHAPTER XXXVIII.

A. D. 1566.

Compulsion now to be used by the Conformists towards the Non-	
conformists . . . . .	89
Doubtful legality of this, particularly as it regarded deprivation .	<i>Ib.</i>
Pressure of motives for action on the Conformists . . . . .	91
Parker sends back his Ordinances or Articles to Cecil with a stern	
letter, March 12 . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
He was not sure of his ground legally, but had consulted lawyers .	92
He arranges his plan of proceeding . . . . .	93
He urgently and vainly requests the countenance of the lay power in	
the emergency . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The Court and the great laymen will not touch the matter . . . .	94
Parker has the London clergy before him and Grindal in Lambeth	
Chapel, March 26 . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Curious and painful scene . . . . .	95
The greater part submitted to his test and subscribed . . . . .	96
Those who refused were immediately suspended and threatened with	
<i>ipso facto</i> deprivation in three months if they continued obstinate	97
Consideration of the position and conduct of the various parties .	98
Parker showed all the kindness that he could . . . . .	99
Diversity of opinion among the Ecclesiastical Commissioners . . .	100
Parker and Grindal . . . . .	101
Parker and the Court . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
He sends a printed copy of his Ordinances or Articles to Cecil,	
March 28 . . . . .	102
They were printed with the title of Advertisements . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
But Parker clung as much as he could to the more ecclesiastical title	
of Articles . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
They were not used in the examination of the ministers at Lambeth .	<i>Ib.</i>
Parker's clever title-page and preface have led most writers into error	
as to the authority and the date of the Advertisements . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>

	PAGE
Parker's Advertisements have been taken to have been Elizabeth's "further order" in Church ornaments, which she was empowered to take by the Act for Uniformity (note) . . . . .	104
Examination of this (note) . . . . .	104
Parker sends round his Advertisements . . . . .	105
He vainly expected a speedy end of the trouble . . . . .	105
Some of the Nonconformists who were not present, and of those who were, suspended, or even deprived . . . . .	106
Alarm felt throughout the kingdom at the prospect of compul- sion . . . . .	107
Letter of Pilkington of Durham anticipating it, October, 1564 . . . . .	107
Letter of Whittingham . . . . .	108
Letter of Lever, February, 1565 . . . . .	109
Letter of Kingsmill . . . . .	110
The struggle in London after the proceedings in Lambeth . . . . .	108
Scene in Cripplegate Church, where the vicar, Crowley, refused to admit a surpliced funeral procession . . . . .	108
Parker and Grindal sit on Crowley at Lambeth . . . . .	108
Scenes in All Hallows, Thames Street . . . . .	111
Other scenes and incidents about Eastertide . . . . .	112
Parker's undaunted conduct . . . . .	113
He bitterly complains of the little support that he had from Grindal, and reproaches the Queen and Council . . . . .	114
Beginning of the literary controversy . . . . .	115
Crowley and two other Nonconforming ministers publish a tract entitled <i>A Brief Discourse against the Outward Apparel</i> . . . . .	116
Parker puts forth an answer entitled <i>A Brief Examination for the time, &amp;c.</i> , and sends Crowley's two colleagues to Bishop Horne's custody at Winchester . . . . .	117
They leave London in a triumphal procession . . . . .	118
Parker sends others of the leaders to other bishops . . . . .	118
Haddon at Bruges informs Parker that the Nonconformist writings were much read abroad . . . . .	119
Grindal's proceedings in his diocese of London . . . . .	119
He began to try persuasion with considerable success even before the Queen's letter . . . . .	120
He tried persuasion after the contest was begun by printing Bullinger's judgment of the lawfulness of the habits, and some arguments of his own . . . . .	119
He tries some severity . . . . .	121
He was overseer of the press, and perhaps not very strict . . . . .	121
At the instance of the Ecclesiastical Commission the press is now stopped, so far as the Nonconformists were concerned, by a decree of Council, June 29 . . . . .	122
This was a most unhappy measure . . . . .	123
Reflections . . . . .	124
Elizabeth's intuitive suspicions . . . . .	125

	PAGE
The Spanish ambassador's advice . . . . .	126
The slacker Conformists and the leading Nonconformists alike seek the advice and approbation of the Continent . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Humphrey and Sampson both propound questions to Bullinger and Gualter . . . . .	127
Bullinger answers in favour of conformity . . . . .	128
He sends to the English bishops a copy of his epistle . . . . .	129
Grindal publishes it in Latin and English, to the indignation of Humphrey and Sampson . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Coverdale, Humphrey, and Sampson write to Beza and his colleagues at Geneva . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Zurich and Geneva hold consultation, English emissaries passing between them . . . . .	130
Bullinger attacked by Turner for his advice . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Beza writes to Bullinger about England . . . . .	131
Grindal and Parkhurst write to Bullinger about the publication of his letter, and the excellent effect of it . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Bullinger and Gualter write several letters regretting the publication and the use made of it . . . . .	132
Parkhurst lets his repudiation of the publication be published by the Nonconformists . . . . .	133
The representations of the condition of England which were made to the Continental divines by the English emissaries . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Who these emissaries were . . . . .	134
An embassy of reconciliation vainly proposed . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The Scottish Assembly offers advice to the English bishops . . . . .	135
General survey of Christendom outside the Roman obedience, as to outward appearance, doctrine, episcopacy . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The Queen visits Oxford, August . . . . .	136
Leicester and Cecil prepare the way . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The Queen's arrival . . . . .	137
Her remark to Dr. Humphrey . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Her reception . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Kingsmill's oration and her reply . . . . .	138
Festivities in Christ Church . . . . .	139
Disputations and lectures in the schools held as usual . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
An English play performed in Christ Church Hall . . . . .	140
Disputations before the Queen in St. Mary's . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Dr. Humphrey shone as respondent . . . . .	141
The Queen addresses the University in Latin . . . . .	143
Calfhill's Latin tragedy played in Christ Church Hall . . . . .	144
Her farewell to Oxford . . . . .	145
Parliament, September 30 . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Act declaratory of the legality of the making of the bishops . . . . .	146
It arose out of Bonner's plea two years before . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
It was far too cumbrous . . . . .	147
And lent itself to misrepresentation . . . . .	148



	PAGE
All that was needed was an explanation why the English Ordinal was not named in Elizabeth's Act for Uniformity . . . . .	148
This Act left Bonner harmless . . . . .	149
Bill to take away sanctuary . . . . .	150
Bill to enforce subscription to the Articles of Religion . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Stopped by the Queen . . . . .	151
Curious history of this Bill . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The Queen dissolves Parliament suddenly, January 2, 1567 . . . . .	152

## CHAPTER XXXIX.

A.D. 1567-1569.

Grindal and Horne attempt to justify the publication of the letter of Bullinger and Gualter . . . . .	153
Wiburn, finding himself involved, makes strong efforts to clear himself of the suspicion of giving false reports to the foreign divines about England . . . . .	154
Withers and Barthlett, the other Nonconformist messengers, do the like, but not so conclusively . . . . .	155
They also write a long account of English affairs to Frederick the Third, the Elector Palatine . . . . .	157
Bullinger expresses to Beza his dislike of the spirit of the Noncon- formist leader Sampson, and of the emissaries . . . . .	159
But he and Gualter expostulate with the English bishops, Grindal, Sandys, and Parkhurst . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Beza suggests that England should join the Tigurine Confession . . . . .	160
Important letter of the Genevan divines to the English, urging mutual forbearance . . . . .	161
Difficulties of Grindal . . . . .	164
The discontented brethren, or Nonconformists, begin to meet secretly, but without any notion of separation . . . . .	165
The meeting or congregation of Richard Fitz . . . . .	166
The meeting in Plumbers' Hall invaded, where the English Geneva service was used . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Curious scene between Grindal and some of the persons arrested . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Grindal refers to Beza's letter, but in vain . . . . .	169
Uncharitable posture of the Nonconformists towards their adversaries They misrepresented Grindal's conduct towards them . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Bonham and Crane, two Nonconformists, imprisoned and inhibited by Grindal . . . . .	174
Whereupon the Plumbers' Hall set, whom Grindal had got discharged, accused him of false dealing to the Council . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
He cleared himself . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The word Puritan probably originated now, not earlier . . . . .	175
Grindal's cheerful account of his diocese . . . . .	176



	PAGE
How far had the discontented brethren moved in the direction of separation? . . . . .	177
Grindal's curious "talk" with a minister named Pattenson . . .	178
His official troubles and tasks . . . . .	179
Inquisitions into the number and condition of foreigners . . .	181
Their great increase: disputes among their ministers . . .	182
Secession inside the Dutch Church in Austin Friars . . . .	184
The Dutch Church sends a body of Propositions or Articles to the Continental churches, 1568 . . . . .	185
They are returned with corrections, which the Dutch adopt for the most part; and the amended articles are printed at the request of Grindal . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
These articles form an interesting treatise on Christian liberty . .	186
End of Grindal in London, 1569 . . . . .	192
Pillage of vacant sees . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Metropolitical Visitation of Norwich . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Laxity there . . . . .	193
Some of the Visitation Articles curious . . . . .	194
Traces of this Metropolitical Visitation in other dioceses . . .	196
The Archbishop's ordinary Visitation of his own diocese . . .	197
The Queen and Council strongly rebuke the bishops for slackness, and demand to know the state of every diocese upon certain specific points, November 6, 1569 . . . . .	198
The answers returned from Canterbury and Chichester, which are very interesting (note) . . . . .	200
Disturbed state of the Universities: Oxford . . . . .	202
Activity of informers: case of Dean Goodwin of Canterbury . .	204
Cambridge . . . . .	205
The jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Commission challenged . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The Inns of Court Romanensian . . . . .	207
Struggle of the religions in London . . . . .	208
The Mass in the Spanish ambassador's house . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The Mass in the Portuguese ambassador's house . . . . .	209
Struggle of the religions among other ambassadors . . . . .	210
The English ambassador in Scotland . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The cross in the Queen's Chapel thrown down . . . . .	210
Doctor Mann, the English ambassador in Madrid . . . . .	211
He is expelled from Madrid . . . . .	212
Guzman, the Spanish ambassador, and Elizabeth . . . . .	213
Guzman recalled, and Guerau de Spes sent to England . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The Romanensians strong in Lancashire . . . . .	214
The Queen rebukes the Bishop of Chester . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
He thereupon visits his diocese . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
And finds Papal emissaries at work . . . . .	215
Many gentlemen obstinate Romanensians . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Sir John Southworth . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The Papal agents not acceptable to the Romanensian clergy . .	216

	PAGE
One of them, Vaux, brings a letter into England, 1566 . . . . .	217
This letter given (note) . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
A 'Bull of Reconcilement' brought, 1567 . . . . .	218
Nicolas Morton sent from Rome with great powers, early in 1569 . . . . .	221
He travels about, engaging adherents . . . . .	222
Mary Queen of Scots flees into England, May, 1568 . . . . .	223
Her presence a rallying point to the disaffection of the North . . . . .	224
Her extraordinary fascination . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
She is removed to Bolton Castle; and then to Tutbury, 1569 . . . . .	225
She conforms to the English Service . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Curious character and intrigues of the new Spanish ambassador . . . . .	226
Cecil puts him under restraint and inspection . . . . .	227
The Duke of Alva cautions him . . . . .	228
Alva sends a military envoy into England . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
His reception . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The chief English nobility open with Mary to marry the Duke of Norfolk in the summer of 1569 . . . . .	229
One of the conditions was to have been to restore the English Book of Common Prayer to Scotland . . . . .	230
This has been misunderstood by historians (note) . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Insurrection of the North under the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, November 1569 . . . . .	231
They proclaim their purpose to be the restoration of the old religion . . . . .	233
Their proceedings and difficulties . . . . .	234
In a second Proclamation they say nothing of religion, but that their purpose was to liberate the Scottish Queen . . . . .	235
They advance to Tadcaster, November 22 . . . . .	236
Mary is removed to Coventry, November 23 . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The insurgents retreat to Durham . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Sussex advances from York, December 11 . . . . .	237
The insurgents fly to Hexham . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Their dispersion and fate . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Terrible vengeance of Elizabeth . . . . .	238
Dealing with the bishopric of Durham . . . . .	240
Comparative mercy of the Ecclesiastical Court of Durham in dealing with offenders . . . . .	241
Curious particulars and anecdotes . . . . .	242
Insurrection in Cumberland under Lord Leonard Dacre . . . . .	244
Battle of Hall Beck . . . . .	245
The 'Homily against Rebellion' added to the Book of Homilies . . . . .	247
The Bishops' Bible published, 1568 . . . . .	248
Parker's instructions to the translators . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Every Bible of the sixteenth century was a commentary . . . . .	249

## CHAPTER XL.

A.D. 1570.

	PAGE
Election of Pius the Fifth in 1566: his character . . . . .	250
Process against Elizabeth at Rome at the end of 1569 and beginning of 1570 . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The witnesses against her were twelve of her own subjects . . . . .	251
The Articles which were ministered to them . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Depositions of Richard and Thomas Shelley . . . . .	252
Of Thomas Goldwell . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Of Maurice Clenock: of Nicolas Morton . . . . .	254
Of Henry Henshaw . . . . .	255
Of Edmond Daniel . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Of Edward Brombrough . . . . .	256
Of William Alott . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Of Richard Hall . . . . .	257
Of Richard Shelley . . . . .	258
Of Henry and Thomas Kirton . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Three of the weakest of these deponents have been recalled by the Roman annalists . . . . .	259
The Pope's declaratory sentence . . . . .	261
The Bull of Excommunication, February 25, 1570 . . . . .	262
It was a calamity . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Reflections on the consequences of it . . . . .	263
It was received with great reluctance by the Romanensians, who desired not to be turned into Roman Catholics by it . . . . .	264
The Bull in effect displaced the old Romanensian bishops . . . . .	267
The Bull received with displeasure by the European princes . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The Pope tries to get it published and enforced . . . . .	269
John Felton publishes it in London, June 2, 1570 . . . . .	270
The perplexed Romanensians get comfort from the refusal of the princes to publish the Bull . . . . .	271
Counterblasts prepared . . . . .	274
Two by Norton, vigorous and popular . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Another by Jewel, and another by Bullinger . . . . .	275
Two by Cecil, which probably were never printed . . . . .	276
The Queen publishes in the Star Chamber a Proclamation that she seeks to force no conscience . . . . .	280
A new stage in the history of Nonconformity begins . . . . .	282
The movement designs to remodel the Church and its institutions . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Thomas Cartwright poses as its leader . . . . .	283
He is defeated in his attempt to storm episcopacy . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
His principles, however, had a brief triumph long afterwards . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
As professor at Cambridge Cartwright is reported to Cecil for his views on the ministry . . . . .	284

	PAGE
He is prevented from taking his degree as doctor . . . . .	285
Cartwright's admirers address Cecil in his defence . . . . .	286
Importance of some of those who support his case . . . . .	287
He writes an elegant protest to Cecil . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Grindal attempts without success to mediate . . . . .	288
The Heads of Houses succeed in suspending Cartwright from his professorship. . . . .	289
Renewed expostulations are sent to Cecil . . . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
Chiefly Whitgift now appears in the controversy. . . . .	291
Whitgift as Vice-Chancellor proceeds to sterner measures and as Master expels Cartwright from Trinity College . . . . .	293
The anarchical character of Cartwright's tenets . . . . .	295
He seems to have run into Independency, and perhaps beyond it . . .	<i>Ib.</i>
The celebration of the twelfth anniversary of the Queen's Accession is kept with great rejoicing . . . . .	296
The strength of her position is now acknowledged . . . . .	297
The day is thenceforward observed with great enthusiasm . . . . .	298
INDEX . . . . .	299



# HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

---

## CHAPTER XXXVI.

A.D. 1564.

IT is said that the word Puritan came into use in the year 1564.\* The first actual record of its appearance seems a little later, at least as it regards its first important application, to indicate the extreme Evangelics, upon whose troublous history we now enter: and it may be well to delay a name which was at first conferred in reproach, though afterwards accepted as honourable. The discontented brethren, the extreme

\* "The English bishops began to show their authority in urging the clergy of their dioceses to subscribe to the Liturgy, ceremonies, and discipline of the Church: and such as refused the same were branded with the odious name of Puritans, a name which in this notion first began in this year: and the grief had not been great if it had ended in the same. . . . Only Nonconformists are thereby intended." — Fuller, ix. 66. Fuller is wrong as to the date of the urgency of the bishops, as well as of the rise of the word. Heylin gives the next year for the word. The reader will find that I put it two or three years later than that. It may be worth adding that Baronius puts the "*Puritanorum heresis*" in 1565, and gives a dismal account of it: "*Pullulasse in Anglia hoc anno ab aliquibus ponitur nova Puritanorum pestis, quæ tam immane in Catholicos odium professæ est, ut in locis quæ ritu Catholico aliquando fuerant consecrata, preces fundere, vel concionari, aut Sacramentum Baptismi conferre abnueret, atque alios hereticos religionis puritatem non colere argueret, cum tamen adeo esset impia hæc secta, ut ad delendam Christi memoriam festum Resurrectionis Christi diem abrogare ut Papisticum niteretur,*" &c.—*Anno* 1565, § 20; Raynaldus.



or incompilant Evangelics, who stood in strife against other Evangelics in the Church of England, may be consistently denoted at present by the word Nonconformist: provided that the proper meaning of this abused appellative be kept in mind.

The Nonconformist was a churchman who differed from other churchmen upon no point of doctrine, but who disallowed some of the ceremonies that were still retained, particularly the apparel of the clergy; and who was prepared to contend against the things that he disliked, rather than suffer them to be imposed upon him. The contest that he raised was the old vestiary controversy revived from Bishop Hooper and the days of Edward the Sixth, a controversy which had never ceased in reality. The Nonconformist refused to regard his scruples as of less concernment than peace: his obstinacy was increased by their minuteness: bitterness is greatest where there is almost agreement: but littleness is a taunt that may be cast to and fro. The Nonconformist, when he was reproached by other Evangelics or "Professors of the Gospel" with the folly of endangering all for the sake of indifferent trifles, could fairly retort by asking his adversaries why they should wound the consciences of their weak brethren about things acknowledged by themselves for trivial and indifferent. To fight upon the needle's point, but to be upon the needle's point, the one not less than the other, and never to quit it, was characteristic of both. The Nonconformist had other names given him in the course of the contest, as Precisian, Disciplinarian. But unhappily for the clearness of history, his best-known name has been arrogated to themselves by men whose principles and actions would have been almost beyond his comprehension, and even so far as they went in his own days,

were abominable in his eyes. This is one of the chief calamities that have befallen the nomenclature of the Reformation.

At this juncture the Nonconformist had the best hope of carrying the day. He observed with disappointment but avidity how nearly he had triumphed in the late Convocation, when his proposals were dashed by a vote of one, a factitious, cumulative, proxy vote. As for the other Evangelics, the Conformists, he knew them all, and could take their measure well. Some of them he knew to be almost of his own opinions; others to be averse from imposing their own opinions upon him. Some of his own party were now among the bishops: and he anticipated their aid or connivance in advancing his views. He was high in the Court. As to the Queen, neither the one party nor the other could count upon the intuitive flashes of sagacity or caprice which dictated her public conduct: but the Nonconformist knew that she was afraid of him in private. In her favourite Dudley, who was created Earl of Leicester about this time, he had, or thought that he had, a powerful patron. In Cecil he found another private maintainer, who, however, set his countenance against him in public. It was necessary upon the whole to uphold Conformity in the face of the nation, for the demands and the practices of the Nonconformist were against authority, contrary to Royal Injunctions and Acts of Parliament: he challenged authority, Cecil and Elizabeth expected a contest. But it was expedient to fight behind a screen: and the Tudor policy was instinctively repeated of casting the blame and burden of the war of an enforced uniformity upon the bishops. It was completely successful. Those reluctant ministers, who were alternately urged forward and deserted when they moved, displayed in vain the

moderation, the long-suffering of charity. They and they alone were seen in the execution of severity, and on them has rested the censure of the ages. The Nonconformist fiercely bit the rods that smote him, observing not the hands that wielded them : and the English nation, allured by a hundred eloquent pens, will ever repeat the story of the cruel rigours of the Ecclesiastical Commission.

The word religion was applied by the reformers of the Church of England to indicate the nature of the changes which they effected and the settlement on which they stood. They spoke of the alteration of religion, of the altered religion, of the religion received, of the religion undertaken or adopted. This was the invariable expression employed by the Elizabethan authorities.\* Modern error, which has so obstinately dreamed that they performed the impossibility of erecting a new church in a nation long Christian, may perhaps correct itself by reflecting upon the accuracy and propriety of the term, according to the original meaning. Religion with the ancient Romans signified not a system of doctrines and precepts, but the ceremonies and institutions established in honour of the gods ; and subordinately the scruples arising out of the observance or neglect of any of them.† The same remained the primary meaning of the word in Christendom throughout the Middle Ages : it was only

\* Her reign began with the notable "Device for the alteration of Religion," which we have perused. In the great Visitation of her first year the constant phrase used in the Articles and declarations was *suscepta religio*. In the *Acts of the Privy Council* the warrants against refusers are always "for obstinacy against the present state of religion," for speaking against "the religion now established in this realm," and so on, *passim*.

† For example Cicero calls the law of Syracuse about choosing the priest of Jupiter by lot a law of religion. "Syracusicus lex est de religione." —*In Verr.* ii. 51.



after the Reformation that the theological and personal sense began to prevail; and religion came to be understood to mean the whole sum or order of revealed truth, and also the divine life entering the heart and having its rise and progress there; rather than liturgic culture, the forms, the rules, the niceties of worship.\* The alteration of religion at the Reformation was, then, the alteration of the public services of the Church: it was in this sense that it was confessed and maintained: or perhaps it may be said that no other sense was known to those who used it. This alteration of religion was indeed as undeniable as great and bold. The religions of the religious orders, the worship of saints and images, relics, the greatest part of the ceremonies of the Mass, Masses for the dead, the Latin language in services and offices, a thousand things, were swept away under the condemnation of superstition and abuse. With them certainly went the doctrines, mostly scholastic, out of which they had sprung. But the altered religion was described also as an accepted or received religion, a religion recognised or adopted.† There was construction as well as there was destruction in the work: old things preserved, and thereunto new things added. The religious or sacro-

\* I question whether any theologian of the Middle Ages would have thought of entitling his treatise *Institutio Religionis Christianæ*, as John Calvin did: and whether any mediæval poet or saint could have anticipated Edward Young in singing

"Religion's all: descending from the skies

To wretched man the goddess in her left

Holds out this world, and in her right the next":

or Philip Doddridge in writing *The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul*. In Elizabeth's reign, when Norden writes a devotional book of the sort, it is called *The Progress of Piety*.

† *Suscepta religio*, the expression used in the Visitation of the first year of Elizabeth, seems to have this meaning. "Religiones suscipere est sacra nova instituere, sive sacrum aliquid efficere."—Ernesti *Clavis Ciceroniana*, s. v.

sanct character was extended to the vulgar tongue. The reading of the Scriptures occupied a more honourable place in the public services : large native portions, as the English Litany, were inserted : the singing of metrical psalms was subjoined. Genuine antiquity was preserved, primitive simplicity was restored. It was because the alteration went not far enough in the way of destruction that the Nonconformists refused to accept it. They still saw in it the dregs of Popery.

Turner, the Dean of Bath and Wells, a man of versatile learning, who is yet remembered among the founders of the science of Natural History, was a Nonconformist who held his cause to be of equal hope with that of the Conformists. "Who gave the bishops more authority over me than I over them," demanded he in the cathedral pulpit, "either to forbid me to preach or to deprive me? Unless they have it from their holy father the Pope."\* The beneficed Nonconformists used such boldness in departing from the appointed order of the Church as to show that they meant to provoke a further contest. They rejected the use of the font and conferred baptism in basins or dishes. Some removed the font from their churches. They ministered without the surplice. Some would that the father christen his child : others that he should be chief godfather. Some said that a child should have seven godfathers. They declaimed sometimes in their sermons against their complying brethren, denouncing particular practices ; as, that the perambulation of parishes on Rogation days should be attended by women.† Parker's own licensed preachers

\* Wright's *Elizabeth and her Times*, i. 169.

† Perambulation had been abused, as it was thought, by being made a procession. Grindal ordered in 1560 "that the ministers make it not a procession, but a perambulation : that they suffer no banners nor other like monuments of superstition to be carried abroad : neither to have multitude



(Parker had licensed preachers) turned out to be among the most vigorous of the Nonconformists: and a compliant man, if he admitted one of those wandering lights into his pulpit, might find himself and his usages made ridiculous to his own flock. Nevertheless the Nonconformists, so far from being advocates of ignorance, valued themselves on their learning: and it was remarked how much they quoted Latin, and how often they assumed the title of doctor.\* One of their chief abettors, Bishop Parkhurst of Norwich, refused to admit to Holy Orders any who had no knowledge of the Latin tongue or followed any secular calling; and rejected one who applied, "for he lacked the Latin and was a butcher." The preachers in the same city began, in this year, the "prophesyings," the readings, expositions, and prayers, which afterwards became well known among the clergy.† In short the Nonconformists reckoned themselves on an equality with the Conformists in all respects. They now began to provoke a contest which compelled their friends in the Episcopal Order to stand against them. Such bishops as Horne would have been content to abide in the posture which some of them defined about this time to their foreign correspondents Bullinger and Gualter: that as they were not bishops, nor were

of young light folks with them, but the substantial of the parish, according to the Injunctions: the ministers to go without surplices and lights, and to use no drinkings except the distance of the place required," &c.—Wilkins, iv. 219.

\* Most of these illustrations are from Strype's *Parker*, vol. i. p. 152 (Bk. ii. ch. xix.), taken from a contemporary paper.

† "Since your departure from Norwich the preachers from the city have taken in hand, both for their better exercise and also for the education of the people, prophesying: which is done once in three weeks, when one first interprets a piece of the Scriptures, which at present is Paul to the Romans, for an hour, and then two others reply for half an hour, when we end with prayer."—Edw. Gaston to Haddon, Norwich, Oct. 16, 1564.—*Elizabeth St. Pap. Domest.*, Addenda, p. 552.

present in the House of Lords, at the time of Elizabeth's first Parliament; so neither were they greatly concerned to carry out the measures that were then ordained: and they would willingly have overlooked things that were now forced upon their notice.

The vigorous Calfhill distinguished himself, to the disgust of the temperate Haddon, by a sermon full of contention, which he preached before the Queen in the summer. "It was a downright challenge," exclaimed Haddon, "it was most offensive. The Queen's presence demands more decency than that. No one has ever given less satisfaction in that capacity. Every one was annoyed; the more so because he is a master of the pulpit, and a fine orator. Vanity is the plague of genius. If court preachers go wild, we shall have religion wrecked."\* Calfhill indeed, fierce against the Romanensians on the one part, stood forth on the other at this moment as a leader among the Nonconformists. Being Dean of Bocking, he troubled the conforming clergy over whom he had jurisdiction, and encouraged irregularity. He gave a new charge every year in his visitations, which was said to be new in the sense of enjoining novelties.†

\* "Calfhillus coram Regina concionem habuit plane militarem, in qua tantum ex omni parte fuit offensionis, quantum nec ego libenter commemorare possum, nec tibi jucundum erit ad audiendum. Plus moderationis requirit Reginae presentia, venerationis aliquid amplius et verecundiæ. Nunquam in illo loco quisquam minus satisfacit, quod majorem ex eo dolorem omnibus attulit, quoniam admodum est illis artibus instructus, quas illius theatri celebritas postulat. Sed nescio quomodo fastus optimorum ingeniorum fere pestis est, nisi meditatione rerum celestium condocefiat. Nisi mansuetiores spiritus posthac concionatores ad aulam attulerint, metuo ne multum ex eorum temeritate damni religio sit acceptura." To Parker, July 1564.—Parker's *Corresp.*, p. 218.

† Strype's *Parker*, i. p. 304. Strype is mistaken in thinking that the Dean of Bocking was Cole: it was Calfhill. Cole was Archdeacon of Essex. Calfhill died in 1570, at the age of forty, and was buried in the chancel of Bocking Church.—Biog. Notice in Parker Soc. In one of his charges he forbade the clergy to turn eastward in the service at the altar.

This was among the several provocations that were brought under the notice of Parker.

The new Spanish ambassador, Don Guzman de Silva, arrived in the middle of the year with full instructions from Philip. The fruitlessness of all remonstrances made in his name against the daily rapine committed by the English on the seas upon his Spanish and Flemish subjects, unredressed in spite of the numerous promises of the Queen, was grievous to the King. "You will address to the Queen and her Council a very vigorous representation, and not allow yourself to be put off with any sort of excuse that they may wish to palm upon you." The case of the Romanensians moved him, but not so much. "You will request the Queen that the Catholics in England may not be forced to follow this new religion, so called, for the Evangelical law itself, in the false sense that the sectarians accept it, permits none to be forced into it.\* You will proceed as you see the Queen inclined: and let me know what you arrange for the oppressed and maltreated Catholics: for I have promised the Pope to appeal to the Queen through you." He desired to lengthen his arm upon his own exiles for the sake of religion. "You will diligently gain information concerning the Spanish heretics who may be there, their names, what part of Spain they come from, their rank, what they are doing; advise me of all, and send the information also to the Inquisitor-General, the Archbishop of Seville. Send to the Duchess of Parma intelligence of heretics coming and going in the States, or corresponding with the people there. Let her know of Spaniards passing through Flanders from England to Geneva or Germany: in short, anything of the sort that you can

\* A fine argument for Philip.



learn." As to the arrest and ill treatment of Englishmen in Spain, "You will lay before the Queen the true state of the case." This was in answer to a strong remonstrance which the Queen herself had lately addressed to Philip on the cruelty exercised towards her subjects trading to Spain, that "their ships and merchandise were arrested, and they so straitly handled in prison that many of them were dead, and more were likely to die."\* She received the new envoy very graciously, entertained him with splendid ceremony at a supper, where she set her musicians to play *The Battle of Pavia*, a piece which may be supposed to have commemorated the famous victory of Philip's father over Philip's father's rival. That, she said, was the music which she enjoyed the most. A comedy followed: and a masque.†

Her royal progresses, or itineraries through the realm to the castles of nobles or the seats of learning, were a popular mode of diffusing her presence: and in the number and magnificence of them Elizabeth exceeded every English sovereign. Her visit to Cambridge in the August of this year was among her notable events. It was prepared by Cecil the Chancellor and Bishop Grindal: who bade the Vice-Chancellor and the Heads be ready "to welcome her with all manner of ecclesiastical exercises: sermons both Latin and English, disputations in all faculties, comedies and tragedies, orations and verses both in Latin and Greek." They, receiving such a charge, sent the proctors to London with humble letters of inability and apprehension: and were assured by Lord

\* The Queen to Philip, March, 1564.—*For. Cal.*, p. 82.

† Instructions to Guzman, January, 1564, *Span. Cal.* 349; and Instructions to Guzman from the Duchess of Parma, June, 1564, *ib.* 355. Guzman to Philip, July.—*ib.* 367.

Robert that they need not fear but that their exercises for the Queen's entertainment would be taken in good part. The whole order of ceremony was arranged down to the minutest point. Cecil himself, though sick, arrived previously at Cambridge to inspect the preparations: and the sister University sent several doctors to observe the performance of her rival. Upon the day appointed all Cambridge stood arrayed on either side of the west door of King's College Chapel: scholars, bachelors of law, regents, doctors; scholars, bachelors of divinity, non-regents, doctors: the Vice-Chancellor upon the steps. All were strictly ordered to keep their place. The scholars, when the Queen passed, were to kneel, cry "Vivat Regina!" and quietly depart to their colleges, leaving the field to their seniors. All the bells in the town were kept ringing. Negligent bells were heavily fined. Bishop Cox of Ely and other honourable personages rode out to meet her Majesty, and returned with Bishop Guest of Rochester and the rest of the Queen's train. She appeared on horseback in a habit of black velvet and a spangled hat: and was received by town and gown with all manner of observance. As she passed the scholars, the masters, and the doctors, two of each degree, presented orations in prose and verse, which she took, and handed to her followers. At the door of the chapel the public orator, Masters, made his oration of half an hour without book. As he extolled her virtues, she shook her head, bit her lips and fingers, and broke forth in a sort of passion with "Non est veritas," and "Utinam." As he claimed for Cambridge an antiquity beyond Oxford and Paris: that Cambridge was the pellucid fountain out of which the others rose, he was marked with wrathful regards by the ambassadors of Oxford. She commended the



orator, marvelling at his memory; that she would have answered him in Latin, but that she feared to speak false to be laughed at: and offered him and all the doctors her hand to kiss. Four doctors bore a canopy over her as she entered the chapel, which was richly dight. The choir sang a song of gladness. The Provost in a cope intoned the *Te Deum* in English, which was solemnly sung with the organs. Evensong followed, every man standing in his cope. She admired the chapel, excelling any in her dominions: and thought that she had been so received as that it could not have been better. Next morning being Sunday, she came at midday to the sermon *Ad Clerum*, which was preached by Doctor Perne in his cope. As he took off his cap by way of reverence, she sent him a message in the midst of his sermon to put it on again. At the end she said that it was the first sermon in Latin that she had ever heard, and she thought never to hear a better. It was a judicious discourse upon *Omnis anima potestatibus supereminentibus subdita sit*, divided into three parts, the authority of the prince, the virtues of the prince, and the obedience of the subjects: in the course of it the preacher inveighed against the Anabaptists, the *Spirituales*,\* and the Pope. In the evening she came again, and Evensong was begun twice because she was not expected: and she stayed to a heathen play, the *Aulularia* of Plautus, which was performed in the chapel, on a scaffold made at her cost, the rood-loft being turned into a gallery for lords and ladies.†

In their own field, the Schools, the Disputations, the doctors shone. On Monday at eight of the clock the University bell sounded to ordinary lectures: pro-

\* It is difficult to guess who are meant by the *Spirituales*.

† This scandalous profanity lies not all at the door of the University. They had set up a stage in King's College Hall for the representation. But it was thought too small, and taken down again.

claiming the term resumed, to continue all the time of the Queen's abode, and all things touching all exercises to be done as fully as at any other time. The ordinaries or professors read as usual : and Secretary Cecil and the other lords and gentlemen came to the Schools and listened to the lectures. At the chief display, which was reserved to a later hour in the University church, the Queen herself and all her court appeared. She sat on a high throne at the east end of St. Mary's : beneath her on a stage to the south sat Cecil the Chancellor, and west of him the divines ; on the north sat Haddon, Master of Requests, come from London, with the lawyers and physicians ranged west of him. The lords and ladies occupied the body of the church. She was informed of everything by Cecil : and rapidly understood the order, difference, and placing of every person, making a sharp remark upon the soiled and torn hoods and habits of some of the masters.\* She gave leave to open the disputation : the questions were delivered to her ; and the respondent made his oration. Four Masters of Arts replied to him and disputed ; and with them the Queen was so well pleased that she suffered not their prolixity to be checked by the proctors. The questions were determined by Haddon in a long oration. On the next day the ordinary lectures were held and frequented

\* The roughness of those scholastic combats is well described in a long Latin poem, about 2,000 verses, written on this occasion by Haddon's friend Hartwell, entitled *Regina literata* : which is found in the first edition of Nichols' *Progresses*, vol. i. The visit of the Court to the Schools thus :—

“ Hora vocat : lis est ! Physicis notissima : visu  
 An magis auditu turba perita sumus.  
 Exoritur verbis atrox sine sanguine bellum,  
 Undique stat Procerum conglomerata manus.  
 Et lites studiosa notat, gentisque togatæ  
 Sudores, curas, facta videre juvat.”

as before : but her Majesty only came at night to an English play called *Ezechias* in King's College. The day following, August 9, she made the progress of the colleges, riding in royal state, and received everywhere with gratulatory orations in Greek and Latin, in verse and prose. They presented her with two fair books written in the Roman hand, covered with red velvet, the one containing the verses that had been written to celebrate her coming, and the other the names of the founders, benefactors, and present residents of every college.\* In the afternoon she went again to St. Mary's, to hear a second disputation in divinity. Haddon, who was now the respondent or defender of the two propositions disputed, surpassed himself in his old seat, exhibiting thirteen copies of his conclusions, made in verse. Five doctors oppugned the first, and five the second, question : but all of them could not dispute for lack of time. The Bishop of Ely, in a solemn oration, determined the disputation. At the end the lords, especially Lord Robert, kneeling, desired her Majesty to speak something in Latin to the University. She wished to speak in English, but

\* One of these books, the latter, is still extant in the Record Office. It is vol. xxxii. of the *Domestic MSS.* : and is described in the *Calendar* as "bound in vellum, stamped on the covers Elizabetha Regina, containing an account of the founders and benefactors of various Colleges in Cambridge, and the names of all at present in the University." It is conjecturally set down as of the year 1563 (p. 234), but doubtless is of this year and occasion. These two books had been ordered beforehand by Cecil to be made : and Cecil carried them in his hands when the Queen rode round the colleges, and read them to her at every college. "In the one should be written in the Roman hand all the verses both of Greek and Latin, Hebrew, Chaldee, and English, which were made of her coming . . . and every college should be placed by itself in that book. In the other should be copied and digested the Founders and Benefactors of every college, the names of every company at this present time, and their degrees, and the names of all those which had been brought up in the same, which had come to some great estimation in the world."—Nichols' *Progresses of Elizabeth*, vol. i. *sub ann.* 1564, p. 18. The volume exactly answers to this.



was admonished by the Secretary that Latin was the language of learning. She then requested him to speak for her, because, being the Chancellor, he was the Queen's mouth. He answered that he was Chancellor of the University, not of the Queen. "Three words of your Grace's mouth will be sufficient," said the Bishop of Ely. Whereupon she addressed them in an eloquent Latin speech of considerable length; that they should follow their studies with the diligence with which they had begun them, that learning was the passage to the favour of the prince, that she hoped to be numbered among their benefactors by some famous monument, if Atropos cut not short too soon her vital thread: ending gracefully "that they had made her feel, and she had made them witness, the difference between true learning and an education not well retained." When the enchanted doctors roared "Vivat Regina!" she replied "Taceat Regina."\*

The disputations in philosophy and divinity held on this occasion were remarkable both for the theses and for some of the disputers. That "monarchy is the best form of the commonwealth," that "it is dangerous to be continually altering the laws," that "the authority of Scripture is greater than that of the Church," and that "the civil magistrate hath authority in things ecclesiastical," breathed both of freedom and of loyalty, and touched speculatively the great problems of the

\* Copies of the Queen's speech were multiplied in writing: one of which came into the hands of John Fox, and gave him the occasion of addressing her in a Latin letter. The insatiable historian told her that he was making collections for a history of her reign, and asked her to supply him with materials which she alone could furnish, though it would be better for her to write her own commentaries on her transactions. Strype, who gives the letter in his *Annals*, i. 448, makes the handsome reflection, "Had not Mr. Fox been some way or other stopped in the labour which he designed . . . there had been no need of this performance of mine."—*Ibid.* 450.

age.\* Monarchy, on the first day, was maintained by Byng, the respondent, who contrived a blow against the Roman claims: "Who wants two heads on his shoulders, or two minds in his body?" Against him arose, among others, Thomas Cartwright and Thomas Preston, to assail monarchy. Cartwright, soon to be the great Puritan leader, was already high in reputation in Cambridge, when at the age of thirty he stood before the Queen, and addressed himself to his difficult task fearlessly. According to the poet who has sung him, he delivered a bold constitutional speech. "Are we to call Nature a stepmother who loves only one of her innumerable progeny? Are we all scorned, while she dotes on one? One king? One regent of events? One alone of so many thousands to sway the sceptre? Are laws and statutes to be no check? Is reason to avail nothing against a notion void of reason?" In this characteristic manner Cartwright enters history. His learning is said to have exceeded his grace of speech.† When Chatterton had hurled two quivering

\* On Monday, Aug. 7, the questions were:—

"Monarchia est optimus status Reipublicæ.

Frequens legum mutatio est periculosa."

On Wednesday, Aug. 9, they were:—

"Major est autoritas Scripturæ quam Ecclesiæ.

Civilis Magistratus habet auctoritatem in Rebus Ecclesiasticis."

These questions had been selected beforehand in London. The Spanish ambassador, writing on the same day, says, "The Queen is already at the furthest point of her journey, a town called Cambridge, where there is a University. They are there celebrating some literary ceremonies and representations, which have greatly pleased her. One of the learned men has to defend the two following propositions, viz. *Evangelium majorem auctoritatem habet quam Ecclesia*, and *Magistratus secularis auctoritatem habet etiam in rebus ecclesiasticis*." To Philip, London, Aug. 7.—*Span. Cal.* 373. She arrived at Cambridge on Aug. 5, so that there was time for London to have heard of her pleasing reception.

† Hartwell seems rather to hint unfavourably of the matter of the speech:—

"Hoc telum, Cartwrite, tuum est: volat acta sagitta,

Errat, et infecto vulnere fracta cadit."



darts, Preston arose on the same side, and the sound was of a sweeter mode. "Shall I strive with harsh words against monarchy?" said he to Cartwright. "O respondent? What need? Thou sayest that there should be one king. Thou hast conquered without resistance. That there should not be two kings. As long as I live let there be but one. Thy hand, thy hand! Let us exchange gifts. But there are circumstances which may demand the aid of more than one. Virtue lies not all in one breast. Think of the ephors and the consuls." To the surprise of Cambridge, the Queen preferred the noble carriage and admirable elocution of Preston to the outspoken opinions of his opponent. She commended him openly, rewarded him with a pension, and decorated him with the title of her scholar. It was not the first nor the last time that a fine mediocre has triumphed over a man of higher genius.\* It would be unworthy to suppose with some that it was the mortification which he now received that impelled Cartwright to the long and consistent course of Nonconformity on which he presently entered. Another of the disputants engaged in this Act, and kindly but vainly favoured by the Queen, was Doctor Baker, late Vice-Chancellor, known among the Romanensians, who had already resigned a living in London rather than subscribe to the alteration among the London clergy, and was soon to suffer further troubles in Cambridge.†

\* Thomas Preston acted admirably in the tragedy of *Dido*, which was one of the plays performed before the Queen in King's College, on the same night after the disputation in which he acquitted himself so well. He was author of the *Tragedy of Cambyzes*, *King of Persia*, a tremendous affair, to which Shakespeare alludes when Falstaff says, "I must speak in passion, and I will do it in King Cambyzes' vein."

† Philip Baker was Vice-Chancellor in 1561: at the beginning of the next year he resigned St. Andrew-by-the-Wardrobe. He was put last among the disputers on the second day, and would have been stayed from disputing

Peace with France brought a new French embassy at the beginning of June, when De Gonnorre, an honourable soldier, who had been governor of Metz when Charles the Fifth besieged it, arrived with the Bishop of Coutances in his train. Contrary to custom, before being received at Court or admitted to audience, he and his retinue were diverted by the Queen's order to Archbishop Parker in Kent to be entertained.\* In

on the plea of the late hour: but the Queen insisted on hearing him. He began to get into trouble the next year, 1565.—Cooper's *Ath. Cant.*, vol. ii. p. 322. Some rumour of unfairness on the part of the Cambridge authorities seems to have reached the Spanish ambassador, who wrote that "When the Queen was at Cambridge they represented comedies and held scientific disputations, and an argument on religion, in which the man who defended Catholicism was attacked by those who presided, in order to avoid having to give him the prize." Guzman to the Duchess of Parma, Aug. 19.—*Span. Cal.* 375. In the same letter the ambassador gives a curious story: that there was to have been another play, but that the Queen would not stay to see it: that the performers were so anxious for her to see it that they followed her from the town to her first resting-place, and at last she consented. "The actors came in dressed as some of the imprisoned bishops. First came the Bishop of London carrying a lamb in his hands as if he were eating it as he walked along, and then others with different devices, one being the figure of a dog with the Host in his mouth. They write that the Queen was so angry that she at once entered her chamber, using strong language: and the men who held the torches, it being night, left them in the dark, and so ended the thoughtless and scandalous representation." If such a thing took place, it was not under the sanction of the University. Five special persons were chosen by the Heads to appoint the plays that were exhibited before the Queen. It may be observed that the Queen omitted one of the plays prepared for her, Sophocles' *Ajax* in Latin; and that in those that she saw the way of lighting was by torch-staves held by the guard: "every man having in his hand a torch-staff for the lights of the play, for no other lights were occupied."—Nichols' *Progresses*.

\* The Queen wrote to Parker, May 14, directions to receive and entertain the French ambassador.—*Dom. Cal.*, p. 240. He was to receive him with the courtesy due to his place, but not to neglect the place that he himself held in her Church, not to receive him but at the door of his church or house, or conduct him further than the limits of the same.—Parker's *Corresp.* 212. De Gonnorre reached Dover, Thursday, June 1: stayed Friday with Parker, went on to Sittingbourne on Saturday, and on Sunday to Greenwich. His train, more than a hundred, stayed in Canterbury, while he visited Parker at Bekesbourne.—*For. Cal.*, p. 146.

this there may have been a mutual design to teach and learn the truth concerning the alteration of religion in England. The Archbishop received them at his manor of Bekesbourne, and has left on record a diverting account of the innocent arts by which he sought to impress their minds. After the first greetings, when the ambassador was withdrawn to his chamber, he showed himself "under the sight of his eye" walking in his garden and conversing familiarly with some gentlemen of the country. He also put some pieces of armour and weapons in one of his lower courts, where they could see them, that they might observe that there was preparation against any French invasion, and ask themselves, if a bishop were so provided, how much more must others be; and this was the very conclusion, he said, that he was told that they drew. Presently the ambassador and the Bishop of Coutances joined him in the garden. He soon found that they were "soft, good-natured gentlemen," and that both they and the young gentlemen with them were curious to discover what they could of "the order and using of religion" in England. There was among them the foreign ignorance which has prevailed ever since. They thought that the English had neither stated prayers, nor days of abstinence, as Lent, nor orders ecclesiastical, nor clergy of any estimation or learning. They learned with surprise of the "reverent mediocrity," or moderation, used in the ministration of the Common Prayer and Sacraments; of the moderate use, not the disuse, of music. They "heard evil of the Pope" with contentment: they were told of bishops and priests "both married and unmarried, every man at his liberty," without disapprobation: a reassuring account of the results of the suppression of monasteries caused them to sigh for the like in their own land. The



Archbishop pointed to the two Romanensian guests or prisoners by whom his house was haunted, Thirlby and Boxall : and they appeared to be grieved that men could be so mercifully treated and so stiff not to follow the prince's religion. A fish supper, which he gave them, being Friday, finished the conquest of them ; though their entertainer gave them a hint that it was more in respect of them than from his own scrupulosity. As they parted the Bishop of Coutances showed him the once famous letter of Osorius to the Queen, which he had got translated into French to present to her Majesty. This may have been by way of signifying that he was not altogether so delighted as he had seemed. Parker replied that he would have done better to have translated Haddon's answer to it into French : and as to the Queen, she could read it better in Latin than in French. He adds to his narrative of the visit of the Frenchmen the extraordinary reflection that he found on enquiry that they had not stolen any of his silver spoons.\* Parker had been imagining French invasion for six months.†

As the Bishop of Coutances without doubt drew his knowledge of England from the letter of Osorius, which he was conveying to the Queen, he might well be very ignorant. This letter, it may be conjectured, was the first cause of the boundless, crass, and incurable ignorance of the Church of England and the nature of the English Reformation, which has prevailed in Latin Christendom from that day to this. Although addressed to the Queen, it was not private : it had been published and republished in Latin, and extensively circulated on the Continent a year before this

\* Parker to Cecil, June 3, 1564.—*Corresp.* 214.

† "I assure your honour, I fear the danger, if it be not speedily looked to, will be incuperable."—*Ib.* 202, Feb. 3.

time, when a copy of a French translation of it, which was also scattered widely, was offered to the Queen. It had caused some commotion in England, and had received an answer from the Queen's Master of Requests, the distinguished Haddon, and it gave rise to a controversy, now forgotten, in which Haddon wasted his last years, and the historian of English martyrs added to the debt that his country owes him. The author of this *Epistle*, Hieronymus Osorius, a Portuguese ecclesiastic, afterwards a bishop, was unlikely to be conversant with English matters: but even so his ignorance is surprising. He knows not the name of a single Englishman. Of the Reformation all that he knows is that monasteries were destroyed and the Pope renounced. A sect, he cries, a wicked sect, did everything: a sect the like of the sects of the Continent. He implores the Queen to stop that sect. It is irksome to detain the reader over so wretched a performance, but the influence of it, wide and lasting, demands the labour of a swift perusal.

A courtly prelude and apology, the difficulty of the office of the prince, who is the Vicar of divine justice, a flood of fine sentiments. "The destruction of the purity of religion in your realm is to be imputed not to you, but to lawless men. The religion that has been from the Apostles is abandoned: a new discipline is sprung up through violent preaching and books. Everywhere the Christian community is broken up by the impious variety of sects. It is dangerous for princes to foster sects." The composition proceeds in a sort of dialogue between these wretches and himself. "They will say that your sect is not popular. If it is not a popular sect, I should like to know what is." And he draws a dismal picture. "What have these men to offer as to getting to heaven, which



is the great thing, that the old religion is to be abandoned for theirs? They say that they are restoring primitive religion. Excellent! Are they better than Athanasius, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine? The Lord is not wont to assign such work to impious men. Now what was Luther? Incontinent, violent, turbulent, above all popular. What are his followers? The same that he was. Now how could such men have peculiar illumination? I insist upon it, how could they? Let me, gracious Princess, examine how finely the discipline of the Gospel is ordered by them. Have they done anything to make us think that they lean on the word of God only? They will tell me that I talk well, but by the Divine word it is needful to pull down before building up. I know that. Well, where are the walls of Satan that you have laid low: pride, wrath, hatred, covetousness, exterminated to found Christian purity and modesty? That is all very well, say they: but there is something before that. And that is, to rush into monasteries and rescue nuns. How Christian! What next? To uproot monks, and make it capital for any to be monks hereafter. Fine discipline! If a man desires celibacy and contemplation, he can no longer shut himself in a monastery, because there are no monasteries. The heretics of old did the like, as Athanasius tells us. What next? All images of saints, all signs of the Cross, all sacred pictures swept away: everything that might move devotion. Anything more? Sacred rites, ceremonies, Sacraments, will we utterly destroy. Surely this should horrify our minds. But, say they, the sanctity of justification is not in these ceremonies, but in the grace of Christ. Of course we, on our side, never knew this truth: never read of it: were never illuminated by such a ray of light.

Is there anything more? A great deal, they say: wherever we set our feet, we bring our weight on this, to break the power of priests and pontiffs, and cast the yoke of the Supreme Pontiff from the neck of the people. Why, what is this but rending Christ's coat, disturbing the order established by Him, breaking the unity of the Church, and bringing in infinite dissensions? There is one faith; one religion, one Church, to be governed by the supreme authority of one: otherwise religions without number, often contrary to one another, and innumerable churches spring up. Then princes bring the laws of religion under their own power, touch sacred things rashly, and incur divine wrath for sacrilege. These men place salvation in faith only. I say that this opinion, which excludes sorrow, good works, and charity, is not to be called faith, but audacity, temerity, and vain confidence. This doctrine has astonishing consequences. It turns men into stone, like Medusa's head. It binds human reason, takes away free will, and by fatal and eternal necessity sets no difference between a man and a stone. What reason is it that I should be eternally punished for a crime to which I was compelled by necessity: or rewarded for a faith which I have not held by my own will? Such is this doctrine of the Decrees. These authors of liberty take away all liberty. Such is the destructive discipline which they call the Gospel; such is the system that has immigrated into Britain."

It was useless for Haddon to answer this vacuous pack. He could not dislodge it. The happy device of addressing the Queen of England in public gained it a hearing which no confutation could dissipate: a footing which no power of reason could upset. But Haddon's *Epistle* to Osorius was not unworthy of the

earliest layman who enrolled himself among English apologists.\* He admired, not without justice, the fine Latinity of his adversary, whom he treated with great courtesy, only toward the end professing to lose his temper with him for his "too great impudency." He expressed his surprise that a private man should so confidently address her royal Majesty, and give her a lecture on her realm: that, as to what he had to say, it was difficult to determine whether it came of clever dissimulation or stupendous ignorance. Where, asked he, are those portents of religion that you describe; the wandering multitudes, the horrible books and authors, and all the other monsters? Point them out, note the persons, give the dates, exhibit the circumstances. Give us something that can be met. You vociferate without explaining. You have made a collection of cut-throat terms out of Cicero. You say that this sect, which you find here, is popular; exciting men to lust, fury, and treason. Terrible! What a tragedy to be proceeding, and yet invisible! I wonder that you give so long an oration to our Queen, instead of writing to all princes lest they should be deposed

\* This was indeed a combat of Latinists more than of theologians. Osorius had the name of the Cicero of Portugal. Perhaps less from his Augustan eloquence than from the title of one of his chief works: for the *De Gloria* of Osorius was thought to be the lost treatise of Cicero with that title. In the opinion of Bacon and of Hallam "his vein was weak and waterish."—Hallam's *Lit. of Eur.* i. 507. Judging from his letter to Elizabeth he was no Cicero. On the other hand Haddon, who is now the shadow of a name, was put forth by his countrymen as their best champion against this shady giant, but has gained no very high praise from the critic.—*Id.* In his own day he was considered the head of English elegance, worthy to be compared with Buchanan, the glory of Scotland. The Queen's clever answer may be remembered, "*Buchananum omnibus antepono, Haddonum nemini postpono.*" Haddon practised verse as well as prose. Some of his small pieces are sweet, but his Hexameter version of the Sermon on the Mount cannot be compared with Buchanan's Paraphrased Portion of the Psalms.



by this new, hitherto unknown, sect of yours. It concerns them all. The men whom you bespatter with declamation, exclamation, taunt, and sneer, are the professors of the Gospel and the servants of God. The changes which you deplore are the return of light into the caverns of darkness. You leave out Athanasius, Basil, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine! We honour the Athanasian symbol: Basil was a theologian who taught and laboured so that if our monks had lived by his rules none would have touched them: Augustine lamented the flood of ceremonies that had inundated the Church in his days: Jerome aimed that boys and women might know the Scriptures, which your church has taken away and hidden. You give us the bare names of these Fathers, as if that must knock us down, without giving any point in which they make for you against us. You tear the good fame of Luther to pieces. Correct yourself by the testimony of Erasmus. You call him popular. What mean you? If that he considered the good of the people, none more: if that he was a demagogue, read his checks of the tumults of Germany. All his followers were like him, you say. Two of them came into this country, by divine bounty; and if all their enemies laid their heads together, malignity itself could find no flaw in the lives of Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr." He gives the usual account of the alleged iniquities of the monasteries: in which it is impossible to follow him: and of the conversion of their revenues to pious uses: and of the rest of the revolution. "As to breaking unity, we have not rent the robe of Christ: we may have twitched off the Pope's pallium." Upon the great doctrines of justification and election he gravely rebukes the levity of Osorius, and some of the comparisons that he had



allowed himself. "You argue against justification by faith only. How dare you argue against the Scriptures? You audaciously say that the doctrine of the Decrees turns men into stones. Is that doctrine in the Scriptures or not? Holds St. Paul that it turns men into stones when he describes them that are called as fellow-helpers with God? Go to! You have built a huge theatre of sound as high as heaven: utterly ignorant, you imagine that the *Epistle* of Osorius will disturb the majesty of England. Write six hundred myriads more of Philippics, if you like." But one was enough.\*

\* It was considered very impertinent in Osorius to have addressed the Queen of England. On the remonstrance of Sir Thomas Smith, the English ambassador in Paris, the Queen Mother professed great indignation. "Tulit ægre illum Osorii librum existiisse ex officina nostrorum hominum, mihiq̃ mandavit ut in eos inquirerem animadvertiq̃ue juberem, qui istud ausi essent injussu Regis, et, ut dicitur, sine privilegio." So the Chancellor of France wrote. Smith, on looking into the matter, found that the whole Latin edition of 500 was sold out by March, 1564, and could only get a French copy to send to the French Chancellor. Haddon submitted his answer to Smith before printing it: and Smith approved of it, only lamenting that his friend had to fight with so ignorant an adversary. "Verbis Latinum, sermone tersum, sententiis grave. Cum nimium impari videris adversario conflictari, qui nihil preter nudam Ciceronis imitationem adferat, rem ipsam de qua agit ignorat." There are other interesting points about this matter in the *Epistles* in Haddon's *Lucubrationes*. Two of these *Epistles* were State Papers, and are in the Record Office, *For. Cal.*, pp. 70, 73. Smith exerted himself to get Haddon's answer published in France, both in Latin and French, and succeeded, but apparently only by the connivance of the authorities, not *cum privilegio*. So best: if the other side had no privilege: but Smith asserted that they had. "Et cum ille etiam cum privilegio nostras formulas accusandi potestatem factam habeat, æquum sane postulare videmur a te pretore Galliæ (i.e. Cancellario) ut cum simili privilegio respondentes audiamur." For the rest, Haddon's reply was Englished in 1565 by his Cambridge admirer Hartwell, under the title of *A Sight of the Portugal Pearl*. It was attacked in 1566 by Emmanuel Dalmada, Bishop of Angra, in a work printed in Antwerp. This adversary is said to have been more ignorant than Osorius. In 1567 Osorius published a long reply to Haddon: to which the latter was preparing an answer when he died: and his unfinished work was taken up, finished, and published by John Fox in 1577.

The books of the Romanensians over seas began now to arrive, a copious stream that was to flow for years, mostly from the strongholds of Louvain or Antwerp. Archbishop Parker made the remark or lament that they were much read at Court. "They all aim at me," said Bishop Jewel.\* The most notable of them indeed was Dorman's *Proof of certain Articles denied by Mr. Jewel*; such as, that within the first six hundred years there was the Pope held for universal head, the Corporal Presence, communion in one kind, and private Masses. It was a vigorous attack upon the altered religion, containing the commonplaces about the shifting of the table from place to place in Holy Communion: and the comparison of the minister, "turning one while toward south and another while to the north," to the weathercock on the steeple. Dorman strongly affirmed the propitiatory sacrifice to be the first use of the Mass: and from this he drew that the number of people communicating was indifferent: and denied the relevancy of the term private to designate solitary Masses. Here he gives an unconscious testimony to the patient spirit of the English reformers, who, however desirous of increasing the number of communicants in the Churches, are taunted in that they had never yet punished a single person for not communicating.†

\* *Zur. Lett.* 138.

† He puts his own case clearly (p. 109), "Catholics teach that this Sacrament ministered in the Mass, was chiefly instituted to be a sacrifice to be offered by the priest for his own sins and the sins of the people; and next to be a spiritual food for all Christian people to feed upon; and that as the first use of anything may not depend upon the second, but contrariwise this upon that, so in this Sacrament the oblation, which is the chief use thereof, and whereunto the priest is bound, may not so depend upon the people communicating, which is the second, and whereunto (touching so often receiving) they are not bound, but stand at liberty, that without their devotion serve them to receive it, he may not do his duty, that is, to offer

His work, written in English, is said to have been widely read; and, according to the Spanish ambassador, an attempt to answer it in an official manner was forbidden by the Council. No embargo or restriction appears to have been laid upon it. An answer was put forth under the title of a *Disproof* by the zealous and able Nowell, who, about this time, distinguished himself by confuting in the pulpit one of Harding's books against Jewel, which now arrived.\* But controversy on this behalf was not to the taste of the Queen.†

it." He proceeds, as to the appellation "private": "Although for lack of company the priest do receive alone, the sacrifice is never yet the more private or less common. For as no man is so mad to say that a great rich man keeping a common table for his poorer neighbours, hath left his old accustomed wont and maketh now his table private, if, the gates of his house standing open, his table furnished, and all things in readiness, his guests forbear to come: even so in this case, where the goodman of the house (the priest supplying the place of Christ) abideth looking for his guests who may refrain to come." Is this table private? He a niggard? Or shall he not eat that would, because they will not that should?" It is interesting to notice how fully he understood this theory to have been rejected. He goes on to remark that notwithstanding the "terrible thunderbolts" shot against those who being present received not in the English churches, nobody departed, but all tarried still at the celebrations: that the real meaning was not to drive them away, but stir them up to come the oftener, "Or else, if this be not your mind, of so many that be present continually thereat, and be not partakers thereof, why have ye punished all this while no one?" (p. 103). Dorman's *Proof* was published at Antwerp.

\* On the fourth Sunday after Easter this year, at Paul's Cross, Dean Nowell attacked Harding, reading some passages of his book and confuting them in the pulpit.—Strype's *Ann.* i. 451. In November this year he attacked Dorman at Paul's Cross, "where he protested that there was not one true word in Master Dorman's book lately brought over from beyond seas."—Stow's *Memoranda*, 130. In another pulpit with less happy success he was destined to assail a third Romanensian.

† It must have been either Dorman's *Proof* or one of Harding's books of which the Spanish ambassador wrote: "Five or six months ago a book was brought here written in English by a Catholic that did a great deal of good. Those who are considered the most learned of these folks put their heads together to answer it, and brought the answer to the Council for



"Three days ago," wrote one of the Spanish embassy to Cardinal Granvelle at the end of April, "they brought the good Bishop of London out of prison to take the Oath before the Bishop of Winchester." \* The Marshalsea in Southwark, where Bonner lay, was within the diocese and jurisdiction of Horne : the zeal of Horne was supported by the willingness of Bonner's successor or extruder, and the will of Grindal by the consent of Parker, in administering the Oath for the first time under the new statute to the deprived Bishop of London. But these three ecclesiastics entered upon a perilous and unfortunate adventure without the knowledge and consent of the lay power, or of Cecil.† After his deprivation in May, 1559, for refusing the Oath under the first statute of Elizabeth, Bonner had remained at large for a year, when he was committed to the Marshalsea by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners "for matter of religion."‡ The exact reason is unknown. He was

permission to publish it. They were told that they did not understand it, that the reply was not appropriate, and the Council would not give them leave to publish it. Another book by the same author has now been introduced, better they say than the last. They are much annoyed, and are trying to find out who brought it to this country." Silva to Philip, Oct. 14, 1564.—*Span. Cal.* 390.

\* Luis Roman to Granvelle, April 29, 1564.—*Span. Cal.* 360.

† "For Dr. Bonner's Oath," wrote Grindal to Cecil, "I did of purpose not trouble you with it aforehand, that if any misliked the matter, ye might *liquido jurare* ye were not privy of it. Notwithstanding I had my Lord of Canterbury's approbation by letters, and I used good advice of the learned in the laws. I could wish that the judges were moved that expedition may be used before them. A thing obtained with such difficulty would not the better lie without all execution ; and no more meet man to begin withal than that person." May 2, 1564.—Printed by Mr. Bridgett, p. 86, from *State Papers, Domest.* vol. xxxiv. I (*Cal.*, p. 239).

‡ "Dr. Bonner, sent in the 20 April, 1560, upon the commandments of the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury and others, the Queen's Majesty's Commissioners ; viz. for matter of religion." Calendar of the Names of prisoners remaining in the Marshalsea, July 2, 1561.—*Dom. Cal.* 179 ; printed by Mr. Bridgett, p. 84. There is a report in one of the Spanish



now brought before Horne at his house in St. Saviour's, and required to take the Oath. A throng of people, called together, according to his own account, by his adversaries and their beadle, attended him with insulting outcries, to his danger.\* But the dogged courage of the old adversary of Cranmer, Sir Thomas Smith, and William Latimer had not deserted him, nor his skill in legal subtleties. He refused to take the Oath against his conscience, saying that he would give good and ample reason why they could not press him to take it : that the Queen in her absolute power might do as she liked, but nothing would move him from his purpose.† As Horne appeared somewhat agitated in framing the Act or instrument of accusation thereupon, sometimes inditing it himself, sometimes the scribe, and striking out what was written, he said to them, "If you cannot make your Act yourselves, let me help you. Write your own sayings and doings first, and then write mine." With much ado this was agreed : and Bonner afterwards complained that he applied several times for a copy of the Act so framed, but could never get it.‡ Some of the passages of words between him and the crowd on his return are on record, and contain his former favourite but not virulent objurgation of "woodcock." A minister waited on him in his lodging in the Marshalsea, and urged him with the Supremacy.

letters that Bonner was arrested on suspicion of favouring Lady Catherine Grey's succession to the Crown.—Hall's *Documents from Simancas*, p. 92. This is most unlikely : nor does the date agree. There was about this time a considerable stir about a book written by Hales upon the Grey claims. It is a matter on which I enter not.

\* Strype, *Annals*, i. 381 ; from Bonner's exceptions to the proceedings against him.

† *Spanish Cal.*, p. 360. This seems a probable account of what Bonner really said in refusing the Oath. He afterwards denied that he had done so in a peremptory or obstinate manner.

‡ From Bonner's exceptions in Strype, as above.

Without regarding his reasons the Bishop with an oath remarked that he was a well-learned man. The minister asked him where he had learned to swear : and receiving a very profane answer, as it would seem, retorted that "he had some Scripture for blasphemy, although he had none for popery." Hereon he flung out of his chamber into the garden, and bade the keeper command the minister out of the house.\* A certificate of his case was immediately drawn up and returned into the Court of King's Bench by Horne's chancellor, according to the late statute for assurance of the Queen's authority : † and Bonner stood for trial at the next Michaelmas term. ‡

\* Strype, as above, from Foxii MSS.

† See Vol. V. p. 377.

‡ This certificate, drawn by Dr. Ackworth, Horne's chancellor, on Bonner's case, is in the Record Office, and was kindly pointed out to me by Dr. Gee. As it has not been printed, I give it. "Excellentissimæ et illustrissimæ principi Elizab. Dei gratia Angliæ Franciæ et Hiberniæ Reginæ, Fidei Defensori, &c. Vester humilis et devotus Robertus permissione divina Winton. Episc. reverentiam, obedientiam, ac salutem in Eo per Quem reges regnant et principes dominantur. Nobis coram vobis in curia vestra communiter dicta The King's Bench certificavimus quod nos Robertus Episcopus antedictus vicesimo sexto die mensis Aprilis anno regni vestri sexto in domo nostra in parochia Sti. Salvatoris in Burgo de Southwark in Com. Surr. in diocesi nostra Winton. sita, vigore et auctoritate cujusdam Actus Parliamenti ad Parliamentum tentum apud Westminster 12 die Januarii anno regni vestri quinto editi et provisi, intitulati An Act for the Assurance &c., obtulimus et ministravimus Edmundo Bonner, alias Boner, de Southwark predict : in Com. Surr. predicto legum doctori, personæ ecclesiasticæ in sacris ordinibus constitutæ, tunc et ibidem coram nobis comparenti, et infra nostram diocesim ad tunc et ibidem existenti, propositis et apertis coram eodem Edmundo Sacrosanctis Dei Evangeliiis, Sacramentum expressum et appunctuatum in et per Actum Parliamenti anno regni vestri primo editum, et intitulatum An Act restoring, &c. Antedictus tamen Edmundus sacramentum predictum modo et forma tempore et loco prædictis sic per nos ut prefertur eidem Edmundo oblatum et ministratum tunc et ibidem recipere aut pronunciare recusavit contra tenorem et effectum statutorum predictor. ad Parliamentum predictum tentum dicto 12 die Jan. anno regni vestri quinto editi et provisi. In quorum omnium et singulorum premissorum fidem et testimonium his litteris nostris certificatoriis sigillum nostrum apponi fecimus. Dat. primo

But the deprived Bishop of London was not he that might be despatched with ease. He took exception and raised objection against the whole process, against the authority of Horne, against the certificate of Horne's chancellor: and in the suit which was perhaps commenced, but never concluded, great arguments were held by great lawyers upon the question which he raised, of the legal position of the new bishops. "In this certificate," said he in effect, "I am only styled doctor of laws and a person in holy orders, but neither clerk nor bishop. This certificate is said to be brought into court by the chancellor of the bishop, but it says not by command of the bishop. This certificate runs, to enquire in the King's Bench for the county of Middlesex: I am in the county of Surrey. This certificate speaks of an Oath tendered to me by Horne, Bishop of Winchester: Horne was no Bishop of Winchester when he tendered me the Oath. This certificate alleges that I peremptorily and obstinately refused to take the Oath: I refused not obstinately and peremptorily; I alleged that I was not bound to take it, for reasonable causes."\* When these

die mensis Maii, A.D. 1564 felicissimi regni vestri sexto, et nostræ consecrationis anno quarto."—*Coram Rege Roll*, 1210, T. T. 1564; *Rex Roll*, xi. It will be observed how far the terms of this instrument warrant Bonner's exceptions against it.

\* Strype, *Ann.* i. 378. Bonner's exceptions to the certificate were four in number. They were not admitted by the justices. I have added a fifth, about peremptory refusal, from another of his papers.—Strype, *ib.* 379. As to the one about Middlesex and Surrey, Lord Coke says (to whom Strype refers) that, "The question upon the statute of 5 Eliz. was, if Bonner should appear and plead not guilty, by what county he should be tried, whether by a jury of Middlesex, where the indictment was, or by a jury of Surrey, where the offence was committed: and resolved that he should be tried by a jury of Surrey: for the statute of 5 Eliz. extendeth to the indictment only, and leaveth the trial to the common law": and that "regularly by the common law in all pleas of the Crown, *Debet quis juri subiacere ubi deliquit*."—*Inst.* iii. cap. ii. p. 34. Dyer (to whom Strype refers) says that it was not only to be of Surrey but of Southwark.



exceptions were laid before the justices at Serjeants' Inn in the chamber of the chief justice Catlyne, they were not allowed to stop the indictment : but a great debate arose among them whether Bonner could put in evidence upon the issue that he was not guilty because Horne was no bishop. It was resolved to let the jury try it, with the opinion that Bonner would get off if it were so. He made motion for counsel, and the great lawyer Plowden, and Wray, afterwards chief justice, were assigned him.\* He then, his issue being open, drew up a vigorous plea against Horne, touching his episcopal and personal character, and all his proceedings. "Neither statute one nor statute five of her Majesty's reign has power to condemn Edmund," said he in effect, "for those statutes ought to have had the consent of the lords spiritual and temporal and of the commons in that Parliament assembled.† Edmund was not called before any lawful bishop : Edmund must not lose his own soul and the souls of others by taking an oath which has not the due companions of every oath, namely, judgment, justice, and truth. Horne is a usurper, intruder,

"Et fuit tenus que le trial ne sera per homines de Com. Middlesex, sed per homines de Com. Surrey, de vicinat. de Southwark."—*Reports*, 234.

\* Et fuit mult debate inter omnes justic. in camera dmi Catlyne, si Bonner poit donner in evidence sur cest issue, scil. quod ipse non est inde culpabilis, que le dit Evesque de Winton. non fuit episcopus tempore oblationis sacramenti. Et resolve per omnes que, si le verity et materia soit tyel in fait, il a ceo serra bien resceive sur cet issue, et le jury ceo triera.—*Dyer's Reports*, 234. The result in fact was, that all Bonner's pleas were reduced to two heads, his own style and Horne's style. The former was rejected by the justices : the latter was admitted for trial, and the trial was ordered to be committed to a Surrey jury. But withal it was advised that so weighty a matter, involving the legal position not only of Horne, but of all Elizabeth's bishops, should rather be referred to the following Parliament : and this course was followed. Compare Heylin, ii. 425 ; Collier, vi. 392 ; Bramhall, iii. 79.

† What he meant by this I cannot tell.



and unlawful possessor; not elected, consecrated, or provided according to the laws of the Catholic Church and the statutes of this realm; ineligible according to the canons of the Catholic Church; and a person infamed, unworthy, and utterly unmeet. He has conspired with the other schismatical bishops of this realm to put Edmund in danger of his life and goods. Without warrant or authority he called Edmund out of her Majesty's prison the Marshalsea, to the notorious danger of his life: without warrant or authority he sent him back to the Marshalsea again, to the great danger of his life; a wilful, heady, and lewd enterprise! Let him be called to answer for this. Let Edmund have liberty to sue him and his complices. This Horne was not lawfully consecrated by the statute of Henry, whereby he that is consecrated must have one archbishop and two bishops at his consecration, or else four bishops.\* He ought to be punished for his doings, and expelled from Winchester as an intruder. He is a notorious lecher, adulterer, schismatic, and heretic: not fit to exact an oath, or make a certificate. If the Queen's Majesty were informed of the truth herein, she would not be offended in any wise with this defendant."†

He wrote to the Queen a little later, a Latin letter, not uncourtly, impolitic, or devoid of flattery. "The gods are to be approached with religious veneration: thou, O most gracious Queen, art a goddess on earth, I cannot in my bonds approach thee myself. I am an

\* Horne was consecrated by Canterbury, London, St. David's, and Lichfield.

† I have condensed his several papers which Strype gives from his manuscripts: and have concluded that those in which he calls himself "the said Edmund" were written before those in which he calls himself "this defendant."—*Annals*, i. 379–82. The reader may observe that by calling himself by his Christian name only he assumed the usual style of a bishop.

Ovid addressing his Cæsar from afar. I greet thee in a verse. I am happy or miserable according to thy judgment of me. Would I detract from thy supreme power? Never. It is to be respected and maintained by all. If thou shouldst answer that there is no question of thy power, I know it, O Queen, and I grant it. I am not a civilian not to have learned that it is as sacrilege to think other of the power of the prince than the prince thinks. Why then, you ask, have I not taken the oath according to the statute? Hearken, O Queen; O model of piety, hear me! Sometimes an oath is to be taken, sometimes not. Thou wilt request me to explain further. Well then, an oath is to be taken when it can be kept without peril of eternal salvation. It is to be taken when it has the companions of judgment, justice, and truth; when that is lawful and just which is sworn. It is not to be taken otherwise. So St. Jerome lays down; so Innocent the Third affirms." And so on.\* The Spanish ambassador secretly gave Bonner encouragement. He urged the case to Lord Robert; he communicated with the bishop himself; † he procured a letter on his behalf to be written to the Queen by King Philip; but this was not presented, because the suit was suspended by order.‡ The suit was kept depending for two

\* Strype's *Grindal*, Bk. i. App. No. x. He gives "quod olim Cæsari dixit Ovidius absens":

*Ingenium vultu statque caditque tuo,*

and finishes with another verse,

*Parcere prostratis est nobilis ira leonis.*

His letter was of October 26. He appends extracts from SS. Jerome and Augustine.

† De Silva to Philip, Oct. 14.—*Span. Cal.* 388, 389. He tells a curious story about a secret summons being obtained for Bonner to appear at a place twenty-nine miles away, to be condemned for contempt in not appearing. It seems nonsensical.

‡ "At this moment I am informed that the case against the Bishop

years, to the next Parliament, and (as it has been said) was never concluded. In the meantime the Romanensians exulted in the stoutness of their champion and the perplexity of their adversaries. The fame of Bonner's resistance resounded through the world; and the remissness of justice in the south augmented the turbulence and disorder of the north.\* Elizabeth was still riding by balance when this adventure befell. The Romanensians still had hope. There were rumours of Cecil's favour waning. The Spanish ambassador sought to engage Lord Robert on the papal side, and received friendly assurances from him to the great satisfaction of King Philip. The Romanensians told him that Lord Robert was "their weapon" against Cecil, not only from rivalry but because he was a faithful Catholic. There were rumours of the impending disgrace of Bacon, Cecil's brother-in-law.† The Queen told the ambassador in one of their inter-

of London has been ordered to be suspended. The letter will not therefore be presented now, as I had intended." De Silva to Philip, Nov. 13.—*Span. Cal.* 392, cf. 396. It is said in one of the Spanish letters that the Queen "gave orders to mitigate the confinement of the Bishop of London." If there was truth in that, it seems to have been before his bout with Horne, not after it.—Hall's *Documents from Simancas*, p. 93.

\* "The tale is, that Bonner in his defence at his arraignment said that there was never a lawful bishop in England, which so astonished a great number of the best learned, that yet they know not what answer to give him: and when it was determined he should have suffered, he is remitted unto the place from whence he came, and no more said unto him." Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh, March 30, 1565, quoted by Mr. Bridgett, *Cath. Hierarchy*, 87, from P. R. O. *Scotland*, x. 66. The Archbishop of York, writing to the Queen in June, 1565, said that "the cause of the inconstancy and murmuring of the people in the north, touching the alteration of religion, arises . . . chiefly through the remiss dealing of the judges and lawyers of the King's Bench, who wrest laws at their pleasure, with Mr. Bonner, late Bishop of London, and Doctor Palmes: they have been long dallied with, but people persuade themselves that you would not have such offenders punished."—*State Pap. Dom.* Addenda, *Cal.* p. 567.

† See up and down in the *Spanish Calendar* under this year.



views that she never read the books of the Germans, but only St. Jerome and St. Augustine.\* Speaking of the beginning of her reign, she said, with some ambiguity, that she had been obliged to conceal her real feelings to prevail with her subjects in matters of religion, but that God knew her heart, which was true to His service, with other words added “to give him to understand that she was right in spirit, but not so clearly as he could have wished.”† The cross still stood in her chapel, though preachers inveighed and scandalised precisians protested against it:‡ and to the ambassador she signified that she should order crosses to be put in the churches, remarking at the same time that some of the newly rebuilt churches had crosses on the towers.§ Another comfortable thing that he observed was that there were very few Evangelics (or Protestants so called) put into the lord-lieutenancies of counties, for the reason that there were few of that way of thinking to be found, who were fit for such office.|| There were also continual rumours of the increase of the other side in numbers. But, as he truly said, there was no certainty in anything, “absolutely none.”

The death of the Emperor Ferdinand, a virtuous and holy prince, was not notified officially to the Queen of England. This breach of high etiquette,

\* It would be like her if she only meant by this that she had been reading the postscript of Bonner's letter. For Bonner had there given her to study at her leisure two extracts, one from St. Jerome, the other from St. Augustine. See above, p. 35.

† *Span. Cal.* 387.

‡ *Ib.* 393.

§ About this time a gentleman of Gloucestershire, Tracy, son of that Tracy who wrote an admired last will and testament (Vol. I. p. 116 of this work), took upon him in a letter to urge Cecil to use his interest with the Queen to get the cross removed.—*Strype, Ann.* i. 507.

|| *Span. Cal.* 393.



though designed, prevented not the observation of obsequies, customary in honour of neighbouring sovereigns, by the Queen's appointment, in St. Paul's, October 2. A hearse richly garnished, the choir hung with black, with escutcheons of the arms of the deceased, might recall the funerals of the King of the French five years before. The ceremony began with "a certain kind of evening prayer," and the next morning a communion and a sermon. But the spectators observed that there were "no lights, of wax or otherwise," and that the communion went "to the offertory and no further."\* And the preacher himself, who was the Bishop of London, bade them note another difference from the former obsequies, that "there was no prayer for the soul of Ferdinandus." His sermon was an elaborate and learned vindication of the ceremony, both against "those who said there was too little done and those who said there was too much." He extolled the deceased, particularly in his points of contest with the Pope, inveighed against several of the Roman doctrines and practices, and bade his hearers thankfully embrace and Christianly use the merciful gift of the Gospel.†

The exact succession of events in the first two or three years of the Nonconformist contention has been confused by the uncertainty of dates: insomuch that a consistent narrative of it has never yet been exhibited to the nation. Undated documents assigned by guess to wrong years, the same mistakes repeated by one writer from another, have dulled the view again and again: in a bewildering manner the end is put at the

\* Stow's *Memoranda* in Gairdner's *Three Chronicles*, Camden Soc., p. 129.

† Grindal's sermon, which remains, is of steady rather than high flight, very full of sense. It was memorable enough to be clothed in Latin by the fine hand of Fox.

beginning, and the beginning at the end, of events and proceedings which in reality were reasonably consequential. I must endeavour to draw the conglomeration of calamity into lineal order: but neither, if I succeed, will it be without the feeling of respect and gratitude towards predecessors who did so much, and gathered so largely, in times when the materials of history lay scattered in a hundred hiding-places: nor can I hope myself to be free from error. In particular, an acknowledgment is due to the unwearied, modest, and benevolent John Strype, who is the chief authority for all this period of the annals of the English Church.

The most eminent of the Nonconformists in learning and position at this time were the returned exiles, Sampson, Dean of Christ Church, who had declined a bishopric, and Humphrey, President of Magdalen and Regius Professor of Divinity in Oxford. With these distinguished abnegants Parker appears to have endeavoured a composition at the end of the year 1564; and the whole ground of the difference was amicably and formally discussed between them and the Primate and some of the other bishops and doctors. If the attempt had sped, the widening wound, which cried so loud, might have been closed at once. It has escaped notice that the first effort of Parker, who is so constantly blamed for all that befell, was to conciliate. In December he sent to Sampson and Humphrey ten questions in writing: of which the first was, "Whether the surplice were wicked or indifferent?" and the last, "Whether one who was entered into the ministry should cease from it rather than wear the apparel appointed by authority?" The first nine of these questions they answered at some length, in the contrary sense: the last they left unanswered.\* The Arch-

\* Strype's *Parker*, Bk. ii. ch. xxiii.; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, i. 169.

bishop hereupon, whether by himself or some other learned persons, returned a copious refutation of their answers, with collections out of the Councils and Doctors.\* Another paper, of six reasons against apparel of ministers, drawn into syllogisms, was probably the manifest of Sampson and Humphrey: and this was answered at great length by Bishop Guest of Rochester.† The Primate then drew up a scheme of the arguments and the answers that had been put forth on either side; and a sum of the same controversy, as it had been formerly managed between the

The questions were, in short: 1. Is the surplice bad or indifferent? 2. If not indifferent, why not? 3. May an ordinary, detesting Papistry, enjoin the surplice: and ought a minister to obey? 4. Is the cope indifferent, appointed to be worn by law for reverence of the Sacrament, not for superstition? 5. Whether anything that is indifferent may be enjoined godly to the use of Common Prayer, or Sacraments? 6. May abstinence be constituted by the magistrate on days prescribed? 7. May different apparel from laymen be appointed for ministers? 8. Ought ministers going in such apparel as papists used to be condemned by any preacher? 9. Whether such preachers to be reformed and restrained, or no? 10. Ought a minister to cease from his ministry rather than wear the apparel? The answers were somewhat lengthy, grave, and respectful: but always escaping to the Nonconformist side by some qualification, even when they seemed to go the other way. It may be observed that the zeal of Neal has led him to touch up both the questions and the answers a little, though he had the original before him in Strype. Thus Question 3 is, "Whether the ordinary, detesting of Papistry, may enjoin the surplice to be worn, or may enforce the Injunction already made?" &c. Neal gives this, "Whether the ordinary (or bishop), detesting Papistry, may enjoin the surplice to be worn, and enforce his Injunction?" Parker probably meant the Queen's Injunction. The Answer to Question 4, about the cope, contains, "Decency is not gained by that which hath been devised and used to deface the Sacrament." Neal invigorates this into "Decency is not promoted by a cope, which was devised to deface the Sacrament."

\* Strype mentions this, but adds that it was too long for him to insert: and unfortunately supplies no reference where it may be found.—*Parker's Life*, as above (vol. i. p. 167).

† Guest's Answers to the "Reasons that the Apparel of Priests ought not to be worn" is in Strype's *Parker*, Bk. ii. Append. 31, "ex MS. penes me." The Reasons are very weak.



foreigners Bucer and Laski:\* nor was it ere these preliminary labours and encounters were at an end that he deemed the ground sufficiently clear for an attempt at actual accommodation. He then drew up a Proposition, in one sentence, for subscription: to the effect that in the Church of England difference of apparel might be used without impiety, if there were no notion of worship or of necessity in the use. This, being signed by himself, London, two other bishops, and the doctors of the Ecclesiastical Commission, was called the Proposition of the Bishops: but unanimity was not found even in Lambeth. An additional clause was needed to express the charity and secure the adhesion of two of them, who had scrupled: and a supplemental paragraph of four reasons for taking away difference of apparel, which he unexpectedly produced, revealed dubiously the mind of Dean Nowell.†

\* Parker's digest of "Argumenta" and "Responsiones" contains some interesting things: e.g. "Minister Ecclesiæ non est sacerdos sacrificans, nec umbra Christi: uti potest ritibus non mystice significantibus, sed suo ministerio aptis."

† The "Propositio Episcoporum" was this: "Ministri in Ecclesia Anglicana, in qua Dei beneficio pura Christi doctrina et fidei Evangelicæ predicatio jam viget, quæque manifestam detestationem Antichristianismi publice profitetur, sine impietate uti possunt vestium discrimine, publica autoritate jam præscripto, tum in administratione sacra tum in usu externo, modo omnis cultus et necessitatis opinio amoveatur." This was subscribed by Canterbury, London, Winchester, and Ely: by Dean Goodman of Westminster, and by Doctors Robinson, Bickley, and Hill. Two other persons, whose names were concealed by Parker under the letters M. N., subscribed with the additional clause, "Eorumque, quibus persuasum non est, ratio juxta charitatis regulam, a divo Paulo (*Rom. xiv.*) præscriptam, habeatur." Dean Nowell added a curious paragraph which might be taken one way or the other: "Optamus tamen hoc vestium discrimen propter has causas tolli: 1. Propter abusum in ecclesiis Anglicanis metuendum. 2. Propter plenior declarationem corruptæ et superstitiosæ religionis. 3. Propter plenior professionem libertatis Christi. 4. Propter tollendas inter fratres dissensiones." The Archbishop, perhaps drily, called this "Mr. Nowell's Pacification."—*Strype's Parker*, i. 173.



The Proposition of the Bishops, however, as it stood at first without these additions, was sent to the two Nonconformists. They both subscribed to it. But peace was not the nigher. For under the Proposition itself they inserted that all things were lawful but not expedient or for edification : and under that nullification they wrote their names.

The reader will have perceived from these prolusions the true nature of the Nonconformist struggle. It was not of popular origin, or likely in itself to arouse partisan feeling in the community. It was of ministerial origin, a contest among the ministers of religion, concerning things which the one side termed indifferent, the other trivial, in their appeals to one another : but which the one deemed expedient, the other not ; and which lost the character of indifference and triviality with each alternately, inasmuch as neither held anything of small account in the case of religion. As little is it to be thought that it was a struggle for religious liberty. The men who waged it were too earnest, too spiritual, to have comprehended the notions embodied in that phrase. They contended on the question of a mutual allowance in certain things : but the very reasons alleged by both prove that it was not for religious liberty that they strove. The Nonconformists would not have felt themselves justified in the face of the Conformists in refusing to yield the points contested, if they had not been held to be trivial and inexpedient : the Conformists would not have felt themselves justified in the face of the Nonconformists in enforcing them, if they had not been held indifferent, but nevertheless expedient. And yet, in the inextricable complexity of causes, both parties may have felt vaguely from the first that behind the vestiary controversy there lay wider issues, the pressure of two

irreconcilable systems of church government. Of the vestimentary controversy itself the most unfortunate feature was that it could not be conducted in private; that the enquiries of learning and the voices of reason and precedent might have gradually overcome the prejudices of an alarmed and embittered age. Every Sunday gave an example of variation, of conformity or nonconformity, in the sight of the congregation. The most obvious point of difference was the surplice. The returned exiles had seen the nakedness of Zurich and Geneva. Parker had not. To Parker it must have seemed inconceivable that a man should minister in the church without a garment. It is to be added, however, that all the returned exiles were not Nonconformists. Some of Parker's strongest supporters had both seen and abhorred what he had never seen. Nor were all the Nonconformists returned exiles.

## CHAPTER XXXVII.

A.D. 1565.

IMMEDIATELY after the attempted composition, which has been related, there issued from the lay power a momentous mandate which closed amicable discourse by menace, violently set the lists for the pending conflict between uniformity and diversity, the bishops and the Puritans; and marked an epoch at the beginning of the year to which this history is now declined. On January 25 the Queen sent to Archbishop Parker a peremptory letter, reproaching him and the rest of the Commissioners with slackness and inaction.\* "Through lack of regard given by such superiors as you the Primate, and other the Bishops of your Province, there is crept into the Church, brought by some few persons abounding in their own senses more

\* This highly important letter originated with Cecil, who wrote the first draft of it, and sent it to Parker for correction, fearing that it was too long, and expressing doubt whether the Queen would not lengthen it from indignation that there should be so great cause of correction. Cecil to Parker, Jan. 15.—Parker's *Corresp.*, p. 223. I may add that Mr. James Parker of Oxford has laboriously examined the two manuscripts, and the literary history, of this letter, in his *Postscript to Lord Selborne*, 1879: and has successfully confuted the theory, advanced in the Ritual prosecutions, that it was a commission, under which the Ecclesiastical Commissioners were empowered to take "further Orders," according to the Act for Uniformity, § 25. He has shown that it was no commission, that it was not entered as an official document in Parker's Register, and that it was without the sign manual of the Queen. But when he goes on to suggest that the Queen never saw it, that is incredible. Cecil's aim in sending it to Parker was to have it made ready for the Queen's eye.

than wisdom would, open disorder by diversity of opinion, especially in rites and ceremonies. The inconvenience thereof is like to grow from place to place, as it were by an infection, defacing Christian charity, unity, and concord, the very bands of our religion, unless it be stayed. We have heard of these things a good while: yet we have thought until this present that by you, the Primate and Metropolitan, and your brethren the Bishops, it should have been stayed, lest it should breed a schism or deformity in the Church: for you have had charge herein from us heretofore. But lately we perceive that the same increases: and we mean not to endure it. We therefore straitly charge you, according to the authority which you have under us for this Province of Canterbury (we will order the like for the Province of York), to confer with the Bishops, such as be in Commission for Causes Ecclesiastical, and also with all other persons having jurisdiction Ecclesiastical, in the Universities or elsewhere, by message, process, or letter, as you shall see meet or require assistance. Cause it to be understood what novelties and diversities there are in every place among the clergy or the people. Proceed by order, injunction, or censure, as the cases shall require, according to the laws provided by Act of Parliament. Admit none in time to come but such as shall be soundly disposed and given to common order; and shall before their admittance formally promise to exercise their office, to the honour of God, in truth, unity, and concord; and also to observe uniformity in all the external rites and ceremonies. If you find any superior officers disagreeable beyond your authority to reform, we will that you inform us: for we will have no dissension or variety grow by suffering such persons to remain in authority: for so the sovereign authority



which we have under Almighty God would be made frustrate, and we might be thought to bear the sword in vain. Use all expedition; that we be not occasioned for lack of your diligence to use further sharp proceedings: whereof we shall impute the cause to you." \*

Thus smitten, the reluctant and yet resolute metropolitan entered upon that melancholy warfare which was to consume the rest of his life: in which he was to find himself ill supported by many of his more reluctant brethren, and shamelessly deserted by the temporal power that had impelled him. He lost no time in beginning. Within a week of the Queen's letter received, he sent his missive to the Bishop of London, than whom no man less loved the work, bidding him send in turn to the other bishops of the province. He quoted the greater part of the Queen's letter, with the concluding threat of further sharpness upon failure, the blame to be laid upon himself: "her Highness also saith that she shall impute the cause thereof to me." He bade Grindal execute the premises, and signify to the rest to proceed without delay against offenders by censures of the Church in support of the laws already established, and to charge those having inferior jurisdiction to do the same: to send up to him the causes and demerits of the incorrigible: and to confer with the most apt, grave men in their dioceses, and certify to him what varieties and disorder there might be

\* Strype's *Parker*, Bk. ii. App. No. xxiv. He observes that in a rough draft among the Cecil papers there is a milder concluding paragraph, in Cecil's hand, for which the sharper one actually used was substituted, perhaps by the Queen. It was, that Parker was to use good discretion, that no trouble might grow thereof in the Church: and yet so that neither should any of the froward and obstinate be encouraged to hope for any change of policy or of the laws. Strype has also given a good account of this important letter of the Queen in his *Annals*, ii. 126.

in doctrine, in ceremonies, or in the behaviour of the clergy in their dioceses. The certificates were to be returned to him at their peril in a month, by the last day of February at the furthest.\*

From his own officials of the cathedral church of Canterbury the punctual Archbishop failed not to exact a certificate, which exhibited a tolerable, if curious state of things. The prebendaries declared that no doctrine was taught in Christ Church other than that which was appointed by public authority: that daily prayers were sung at the communion table standing north and south: that it stood east and west once a month when Holy Communion was ministered: that when there was no communion the minister used a surplice only: that in communion the priest who ministered, and the epistoler and gospeller, wore copes: that when the prebendaries preached it was with surplice and hood: that they were all present once a day at least apparelled in the choir: that the body of men called preachers, peculiar to Canterbury, wore surplices and hoods, and that all other members wore surplices: that as to the bread used in Holy Communion they followed the Queen's Injunctions, and used cakes resembling the cakes which served formerly for private Masses: that none lived disorderly.† But, although it is to be presumed that Grindal obeyed the orders of his metropolitan, and sent his letters missive to the other bishops requiring them to return certificates, yet it is remarkable that of such certificates there is but one known to be remaining: and that not from a bishop. The Vice-

\* The Archbishop to the Bishop of London, January 30. Strype's *Parker*, Bk. ii. App. No. xxvi. This and the preceding letter of the Queen are both reprinted in Parker's *Correspondence*.

† Strype's *Parker*, Bk. ii. ch. xxvi. (i. 183). He puts this in 1564, following Old Style.

Chancellor of Cambridge, Beaumont, Master of Trinity,\* sent answer to Parker's requisition before the end of February, reporting favourably of the uniformity of the colleges in doctrines, rites, and apparel. He had called the Heads of Houses together, and required them to make enquiry: and it was found that "all things touching the said three points" were in good order, save that one in Christ's College and sundry in St. John's would be very hardly brought to wear surplices. Touching "the substance of religion now generally agreed upon," he knew of none that impugned any part of it, unless it were two or three suspected papists yet lurking in one or two colleges. The late visit of the Queen may have given the just occasion of the further remark that "two or three in Trinity College think it very unseemingly that Christians should play or be present at any profane comedies or tragedies."† There is, however, another document of the same month, remaining among the papers of Cecil, which may either be supposed to be an abstract of some lost returns that were made, or may diminish our regret at the loss of matter, which nevertheless may never have existed, by acquainting us briefly, under six particulars, with the principal variations of the Puritans."‡

\* The reader will have observed that the authorities of the Universities were included in the Queen's letter. Beaumont would not receive his commands from Grindal, but from Parker direct. From Grindal's abhorrence of the whole business it is not impossible that he neglected to send round to the other bishops.

† Rd. Beaumont to Parker, Feb. 27.—C. C. C., Cambridge, MS. No. cvi. (337). Quoted in Parker's *Corresp.* 226, Note.

‡ Strype has transcribed this paper in his *Life of Parker*, 152: "Varieties in the service and administration used." *Service and prayer*: Some said it in the chancel, others in the body of the church: some in a seat made in the church, some in the pulpit with their faces to the people: some kept precisely to the Book, others intermingled Psalms in metre: some with a surplice, some without. *Table*: In some places



In the meantime the Primate had been engaged in composing a code of conformity, such as might be the standard to be applied in the expected enforcement of discipline. Calling to his side the other Commissioners for Ecclesiastical Causes, Grindal, Guest, and Cox, with Horne and Bullingham to assist, he rapidly drew up a set of Ordinances for doctrine, preaching, ministration, and apparel of ministers, together with a protestation or declaration of uniformity to be subscribed by any who should be admitted to any cure or ecclesiastical office. They were the effect of his meditation of the Queen's mandate. They were partly founded on his former manifold labours for the Church, his monitions and orders: partly they were new; and they appear to have been put into shape immediately after the end of February, the time appointed for receiving the certificates of dioceses. He sent them in the rough copy to Secretary Cecil on March 3. "I send you," he wrote to him, "a book of Articles, partly of old agreed on among us, and partly of late, these three or four days, considered: in papers fastened on, or new written by my secretary: it is the first view, not fully digested. The only devisers were London, Win-

in the body of the church, in others in the chancel: in some altarwise, distant from the wall yard: in others in the middle of the chancel, north and south. In some the table was joined, in others on tressels: in some it had a carpet, in others none. *Administration of communion*: Some with surplice and cap, some with surplice alone, some with none. Some with chalice, some with a communion cup, others with a common cup. Some with unleavened bread, some with leavened. *Receiving*: Some receive kneeling, others standing, others sitting. *Baptising*: Some in a font, some in a basin. Some sign with the cross, others not. Some in a surplice, others without. *Apparel*: Some a square cap, some a round cap, others a button cap, others a hat. Some in scholar's clothes, some in other. This paper is dated Feb. 14, 1564, and Strype puts it in that year, as he does all these papers. Wrongly no doubt.



chester, Ely, Lincoln, and myself. Peruse, return it; I would know your judgment: that it may be fair written and presented."\* Certain he was resolute: but he cannot have foreseen what treatment he was to receive in executing the Queen's commandment. These Ordinances, or Articles, as he called them, and would have had them held to be, were destined to struggle vainly for that rank and title: and to be themselves of questionable authority even whilst they were used to bring the Puritans to conform. In themselves they were not ill adapted to promote a tolerable uniformity and greater efficiency in the ministry: and many among them were for the common benefit. But still they were for the restraint or rebuke of the Puritans. They ordained that preachers should set forth the reverent estimation of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper in the form prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, and move the people to observe the orders given in the Book: that the ordinary should choose the place where the Common Prayer was to be said or sung in any church: that no person, not admitted by the bishop to preach, should expound or exhort, but keep to the Homilies without gloss or addition: that archdeacons at their visitations were to set curates texts to be learned by heart, and hear them say them in their next synod; and that young priests or ministers should be made to answer to the Catechism: that ecclesiastics, and persons of any faculty, should wear the prescribed apparel of gown, tippet, and cap; the gown without cape, the tippet of silk, the cap appointed by the Injunctions; and no hats but in journeying: and that all ecclesiastical persons who served not the ministry, or who refused the Oath of obedience to the Queen,

\* Parker to Cecil, March 3, 1565.—Parker's *Corresp.* 233.

should wear none of that apparel, but go as mere laymen till they were reconciled. For the public service they contained ordinances which have been quoted in the modern controversies touching ornaments: that in ministering the Holy Communion, in cathedral and collegiate churches, the executor with the Epistoler and Gospeller should wear copes; and at all other prayers to be said at the Communion Table to have no copes, but surplices: and that deans and prebendaries should wear surplice and hood in the choir; in preaching, hood: that every minister saying public prayers, or ministering the Sacraments or other rites of the church, should wear a surplice with sleeves. They contained moreover an urgent ordinance, that all licenses for preaching granted by the bishops of the province before the first day of that very March should be void and of none effect, although those who were reckoned fit might be admitted again without difficulty at little cost. Such were among the more notable provisions of this attempted code. There were other things in it at first, which it retained not.

The rough draft appears to have come back from Cecil in a day or two, not confirmed or approved, but by the Queen defaced, and it may have been by Cecil's hand that it was greatly altered.\* It had contained in the preface that the Queen had "by the assent of the Metropolitan, and with certain other her Commissioners in Causes Ecclesiastical, decreed certain

\* I am not sure of this. The alteration of the first draft into the ultimate form may have been made by Parker himself, either now or afterwards. Look at his letter to Cecil, March 28, 1566, when he was passing the Advertisements, as they were finally called, through the press, when he speaks of having taken out what the Queen might object to.—*Corresp.*, p. 271. Nevertheless the corrections seem to show a layman's hand.

rules and orders to be used." It now contained merely, along with some verbose clauses, that the Queen had "by her letters directed to the Archbishop of Canterbury and Metropolitan, required, enjoined, and straitly charged that with assistance and conference had with other bishops, especially such as be in commission for ecclesiastical causes, some orders might be taken, whereby all diversities and varieties among them of the clergy and people might be reformed and repressed": and that "the ensuing orders and rules, by diligent conference and communication and by assent and consent of the persons aforesaid, were thought meet and convenient to be used."

Thus this code was refused the sanction of the authority of the Crown. It had termed its ordinances "laws," "constitutions," and "positive laws in discipline." It was now made to blot those high names, and call them "temporal orders" and "rules in some part of discipline." It had ordered that the Articles of Religion, concluded by the whole clergy at the last Convocation, should "stand in full strength for unity of doctrine," and should be read twice a year in the English version by the clergy to their parishioners. This was entirely struck out. In the part about making licenses void, it had said nothing about renewing licenses and admitting again without difficulty or charge men who should be found meet. This softening clause was put into it. It had limited that an able parson should preach once a month: the able parson now got three months to preach a sermon in. It had ordered communicants to "receive kneeling, as is appointed by the law, and not sitting or standing." This was altered into "receive kneeling, and as is appointed by the laws of the realm and the Queen's Majesty's Injunctions," without mention of sitting or standing. It had ordered



that curates should have the accustomed duties at marriages, burials, and other offices. This was struck out. It had contained that no bishop should henceforth grant any advowson before the benefice were void, and that no bishop should grant any appropriation, unless a synod of bishops should think it reasonable in some special case, and that no bishop should confirm any lease for a term of years upon a benefice. These provisions disappeared absolutely, as it might be expected. In the part about marriage the case of "those who had married two sisters one after another" was removed from consideration.\* It ended with a long regulation that bishops should be authorised to suspend any ecclesiastical person offending in any of the premises, or to sequester the fruits of his living : but that the sequestered fruits should go half to the poor and half to repair either the chancel or the offender's house. This was entirely struck out : and hence it is important to observe that there was no specified penalty left in the whole code : indeed the code at last contained scarce any indication of any process at law whatever.† Such were the chief

\* "Item, that all such marriages as have been contracted within the Levitical degrees be dissolved: and namely, those who have married two sisters one after another, who are by common assent judged to be within the case. Item. That no persons be suffered to marry within the degrees mentioned in a Table set forth by the Archbishop of Canterbury in that behalf." The former of these Items disappeared. The latter was retained, with the added words "And, if any such be, to be separated by order of law."

† This long Item, empowering the bishop of the diocese to examine all ecclesiastical offenders against the Articles, and to punish them with suspension and further with deprivation, was not struck out without the notice of Parker. When he sent back the Articles to Cecil for the last time next year, he wrote to him, "Sir, in our book of articles, the fourth chapter, litera K, we made the pain sequestration and not deprivation. For that much depriving with new fruiting will be taken *in malam partem*." He seems to intimate that it was moderate not to have gone so far as deprivation.—*Corresp.* 264. The only clause left at last in the



alterations. Besides these, there were minute touches here and there which had the design of alleging the temporal fountain of authority along with the ecclesiastical, or else of avoiding cleric terms. Thus, in the public services, where the people were to be moved to observe "the orders appointed in the Book of Common Service," it was added, "as in the Queen's Majesty's Injunctions." Thus, again, the tippet of silk became a tippet of sarcenet, "as it is lawful for them by that Act of Parliament, anno 24 Henrici Octavi." The plain direction that the executor, the Epistoler, and the Gospeller should wear copes in a cathedral church in ministering the Holy Sacrament, was somewhat ambiguously altered to that "the principal minister shall wear a cope with Gospeller and Epistoler agreeably." \*

The Archbishop sent back the Ordinances, perhaps with these alterations, in a fresh copy subscribed by his colleagues,† March 8 : and expressed to the Secretary his disappointment that they had not been authorised by the Queen. He hoped that the original preface might be retained or restored : that it would be very difficult for the bishops to do anything without the Queen's authority without falling into some legal pitfall or another. "If the Queen's Majesty will not

draft that indicated procedure, was that in one particular case obstinate offenders should be "presented by the Ordinary to the Commissioners in Causes Ecclesiastical, and by them corrected accordingly." Even this was softened in the published edition into "reformed accordingly."

\* Strype has published from a manuscript in his own possession a copy of these Articles, differing from the printed edition of them in the particulars that I have noted.—*Life of Parker*, Bk. ii. App. No. xxviii. He calls them "Ordinances accorded by the Archbishop in his Province." In the same work, vol. i. p. 158, he gives an interesting literary history of them, and drops the hint, which I have taken, that they varied curiously from the printed edition.

† On the back of this fair copy Cecil wrote with his own hand "Ordinances accorded by the Arch. of Cant. in his Province. They were not authorised nor published."—Strype, *ib.*

authorise them, the most part be like to lie in the dust for execution of our parts, laws be so much against our private doings." \* This was the first of the many remonstrances which he was to make in course of this business to the impassive minister. He had great reason to complain. He was driven into action; and not supported, but left to sustain himself as he could. He was on the horn of either not doing anything, though commanded, without further authority; or of doing something, upon command indeed, but in his own way, by virtue of his own office and of his station at the head of the Ecclesiastical Commission. It was impossible for him to take the former position and do nothing. His own spirit would not suffer it. It would have been of no use to attempt it. If he had been observed to be doing nothing, he would have received another imperative letter from the Queen. He went on: and perhaps it was better for the dignity of the Church that he acted without the further authority of the lay power. But he ceased not to expostulate: and this part of time is divided between Parker's efforts to get his Articles or Ordinances authorised by the Queen and set forth to the realm, and Parker's proceedings without his Articles authorised or published.

He began at once with Sampson and Humphrey again. On the day that he sent Cecil the rough draft of the Articles, March 3, he informed him that he and the other Commissioners were agreed to have Sampson, Humphrey, and four other of the ministers in London "to conference, to understand their reasons, et cætera," requesting in vain the Secretary "to step over" and be present.† On the day that he sent Cecil the fair

\* To Cecil, March 8.—Parker's *Corresp.*, p. 234.

† *Ib.* It is not known who the other four ministers were.

copy of his Articles, March 8, he informed him that the conference had taken place that afternoon; that Sampson and Humphrey had brought back the letters of the foreigners Bucer and Martyr, which he had lent them three months before at the time of the attempted pacification;\* and that he could do no good with them, for that they were immovable. They asked leave to go back to Oxford, but he told them that they must tarry; and he suggested that the Queen or the Council should send for them, or that Leicester, the Chancellor of Oxford, should proceed with them. He added bitterly, "Better not to have begun, except more be done. All the realm is in expectation. Your honour principally hath begun: it is for you to see that something be done. If this ball shall be tossed to us, and then have no authority by the Queen's Majesty's hand, we will sit still."† Cecil, though unwilling to meet the cited ministers, attended a meeting of bishops, perhaps the next meeting of the Commissioners, to rouse their zeal and overcome their general distaste for the business; where he is said to have spoken in explanation and defence of the Queen's orders, and to have heard with impatience the objections of the reluctant prelates, peremptorily bidding them at last to do the Queen's will, or expect worse.‡ As for the

\* See end of last chapter. Strype thinks that these letters would be those mentioned in Whitgift's *Defence*; viz. Bucer to Alasco and Martyr to Hooper.—*Life of Parker*, 162. No doubt they would be included in the volume of foreign testimonies which Parker soon after caused to be published, of which Strype gives an account, *Annals*, i. 491. Of this publication Abel wrote to Bullinger in June, 1566: "Another book was afterwards published by order of the Commissioners, wherein is declared the judgment of Master Doctor Peter Martyr and Master Bucer, that every preacher and minister may wear a surplice, cap, and the other habits, without committing any sin."—*Zurich Lett.* ii. 120.

† Parker to Cecil, March 8.—*Corresp.* 234.

‡ Respecting the order given by the Queen that the ministers were



cited ministers, he proposed to have them before the Council, and give them a reprimand. But this was not satisfactory to the Archbishop. "If it be proposed," said he, "to have some of these earnest men before the whole body of the Council to the end only to be foul chidden, it will be words and nothing else; and I doubt if it will work to a quietness for the deformities to be openly entreated. All men be not one man's children." He offered in vain to come over to Lord Keeper Bacon's house, with the Bishop of London, to meet the Secretary and Leicester, and consult how to deal in that cause.\*

The Oxford leaders conducted their cause at this time with great dignity and propriety, it is certain: and it is pleasing to remark, that though the contest was soon to be pursued very far, it was without loss of Christian charity and friendship. The good cannot hurt one another in their combats. To satisfy the conscience is a shield which the one and the other may extend, which so long as they extend they are harmless. Sampson and Humphrey addressed, March 20,

to wear a certain dress, which many of them disobeyed on the ground that they wanted to make papists of them, there had been a meeting of several of the new bishops, some of whom asked Cecil to be present at the discussion, in order that none of the others might make his absence an excuse for staying away. He attended, and after he had made his statement defending the order, some of them argued against it in long and windy speeches, which Cecil stopped, and said, "Cease these harangues, and give us some valid reason against the order." They then told him that the garb was a papistical one, and was disagreeable to them: to which he answered, "If you have no better reason to give than that, you have studied but little: do the Queen's will, or worse will befall you." And with that the meeting broke up, to the small satisfaction of some of them, indeed of most, though they put the best face they can on it.—Silva to the King, March 12, 1565.—*Span. Cal.*, p. 406. There is no allusion in Parker's letters to any such incident as this meeting of bishops: and it may be that the Spanish ambassador was misinformed. But a contemporary record cannot be overlooked.

\* Parker to Cecil, March 24, 1565.—*Corresp.* 236.

to the Commissioners for Ecclesiastical Causes, a Supplication in Latin, which was honourable to them, laying forth their motives and position with antithetical grace, and asking for brotherly forbearance. "That we obscure should will or dare in word or deed to give alarm to you renowned and high, for wool and flax,\* is strange and new: we, a few private men, against number and authority. It grieves us: but we are comforted that it is a concordant discord: Evangelic not Papistic, fraternal not fratricidal: without pride and malice, albeit not without zeal and fervour, on both sides. We profess the same Gospel, the same faith: it is but that in things indifferent each should follow his own conviction; for here there may often be room for liberty, and there should always be room for charity: unity is not forthwith broken upon some variety of ceremonies. Need we tell you that conscience is tender? If there be any account of our fellowship in Christ, any sympathy (as we doubt not), let each of us rest on his own full assurance, so that the actual unity of the Faith may be the more solemnly honoured through diversity of observance. There are many great reasons which will move you, we are persuaded, to assent to us. We are not turbulent, contumacious men desirous of disturbing the peace of the Church, which we respect and would maintain: we cannot be newfangled in aspiring to restore antiquity, the full beauty of simplicity: we are not unwilling to be conquered by reason and instruction. But we conscientiously feel that things by nature indifferent are not always viewed indifferent in men's minds, and vary with time and occasion. We hold that the law for establishing the ceremonies of the Roman Church has in it the ground of servitude, of necessity, of super-

\* "Propter lanam et linum."

stition. Because you think not this, you are not to be condemned by us : because we think this, we are not to be troubled by you." \*

But Parker, either seeing deeper or breathing higher, conceived of no indifference in things indifferent. The indirect support which he found to be ministered by the courtiers to the Nonconformists distressed him without shaking his determination. At this moment, to his great indignation, Sampson and Humphrey were both selected to preach at Paul's Cross, a great distinction, in Lent. "This appointment is not appointed by me," he wrote to Cecil; "by whom I know not : either by the Bishop of London or the Lord Mayor." † In truth it was the Earl of Leicester who had procured the appointment of them : and they sought from him for that reason furthermore to obtain a remission of Parker's order to them to stay in London. "They humbly sought to obtain license by his means to depart home to their books, the more quietly to satisfy their promised service of preaching that Easter ensuing." ‡ Parker resolved to proceed to extremities with them forthwith, and regretted that he had been so pacific hitherto. "Sampson and Humphrey," said he, "abuse their friends' lenity, on whom they depend. I would they had been put peremptorily to the choice at first either to conform or depart." § He consulted his lawyers on the exceedingly grave question of proceeding to such a penalty as deprivation ; and found great doubt of his power : that against Sampson his

\* Supplicatio Tho. Sampson et Laur. Humphrey ad Archiep. Cant. et Episc. Lond. Winton. Eliens. Lincoln, March 20, 1564. Strype gives this in full, *Life of Parker*, App. No. xxx. ; and translates it (163). He wrongly treats of it under 1564.

† Parker to Cecil.—*Corresp.* 239.

‡ Strype's *Life of Parker*, 164.

§ Parker to Cecil.—*Corresp.* 240.



jurisdiction might perchance serve, the deanery being at the disposition of the Queen; but not against Humphrey, the presidentship being elective, and the visitor being the Bishop of Winchester. He was not without hope, however, that they might be brought to resign of themselves.

On April 29 he had them both before him, and peremptorily told them to conform themselves or leave their posts.\* “These,” said he, “are the orders that you must observe: to wear the cap appointed by Injunction, wear no hats in your long gowns, to wear a surplice with a non-regent hood in your choirs in your colleges, according to the ancient manner there, to communicate kneeling, in wafer bread.” They answered that their consciences could not agree to these orders. The Bishop of London besought Sampson, even with tears, that he would but now and then, in the public meetings of the University, put on the square cap: but Sampson was inflexible.† Humphrey requested much to be spared the extremity of losing his living. But in fine they both refused to comply, and requested some respite to remove their stuff and arrange their college business. Parker promised to let them know the Queen’s pleasure in that behalf: and wrote the next day to Cecil to ask whether he should inform both the colleges by letters that their heads were no longer to be reputed or accepted, or enjoy any emolument. This appears to have been the course taken, letters sent through the Vice-Chancellor to the colleges: but in Sampson’s case they were expedited, or so it is said, by a special order of the Queen,‡ in Humphrey’s there was no expedition.

\* “I did peremptorily will them to agree, or else depart their places.” Parker to Cecil, April 30.—*Corresp.* 240.

† Strype’s *Life of Parker*, 185.

‡ *Ib.* This seems to me unlikely. It probably arose out of Parker’s

Sampson left Christ Church, Humphrey mourned for him in Magdalen : that the Mass was looked for by them to return if the attire of the Mass were so straitly commanded : that a sword had been put in the hands of the Popish adversaries : that a kind of privy expulsion had been devised for him : that he had been expelled privily, and had not resigned privily : that on all matters plainly necessary, as the Oath to the Queen and all other, full obedience had been rendered by them : that great license was allowed to those who neglected substantial things, while painful preachers were troubled for accidental things of man's device. So he complained in an admirable letter which he sent to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.\* Thus the storm fell chiefly on Dean

remark that the deanery lay at the Queen's disposition. No such order has ever been produced. I am indebted to the courtesy of the late Dean of Christ Church, Dr. Paget, for an exhaustive examination of the Chapter Register. He writes that he has not found "any trace of the Queen's order for Sampson's deprivation, nor of any meeting of the Chapter about the business." He has found "one or two bits of evidence which seem to confirm the belief that the deprivation took place not later than June, 1565." He has given the evidence, which seems conclusive as to year and time of year.

\* As this excellent letter has not been printed before, I will give it. "Your Lordship's letter directed unto us by our Vice-Chancellor (although written in general words) yet it hath so hearted our Adversaries that we are counted no more brethren and friends, but enemies. And sith the Mass attires be so straitly commanded, the Mass itself is shortly looked for. A sword is now put into the hands of those that under Queen Mary have drawn it for Popery, and under the pretence of good order are ready without cause to stretch it only to wreak their Popish anger against us : who in this will use extremity, in other laws of more importance partiality. I would have wished, my lords, rather privy admonition than privy expulsion ; yea, I had rather have received wrongs of my brother than kisses of mine enemy. If we had privily in a convenient day resigned, then neither should the punisher have been noted of cruelty, neither the offender of temerity, neither should the Papists have accused (in their seditious books) the Protestants for contention. Religion requireth naked Christ to be preached, professed, and glorified, that *graviora legis* by the faithful ministry of feeding pastors should be furthered ; and after that go by order tending to the edification, and not destruction advanced. And

Sampson : and he has the distinction of having been the first man deprived in England for Nonconformity. The manner in which his exclusion was effected by the

finally, the amiable Spouse should by all means be cherished, favoured, and defended, and not by counterfeit and false intruders contemned, overborne, and defaced. But alas, a man qualified with inward gifts for lack of outward shews is punished, and a man outwardly conformable, inwardly clean unfurnished, is let alone, yea exalted. The painful preacher for his labour is beaten, the unpreaching prelate, offending in greater, escapeth scot-free. The learned man without his cap is afflicted, the capped man without learning is not touched. Is not this directly to break God's laws? Is not this Pharisee? Is not this to wash the outside of the cup and leave the inward part uncleansed? Is not this to prefer man's will before faith, judgment, and mercy, man's traditions before the ordinance of God? Is not this, in the school of Christ and in the method of the Gospel, disorder? Hath not this preposterous order a *va?* That the Catechism should be read, it is the word of God, it is the order of the Church. To preach is a necessary point of a priest. To make quarterly sermons is law. To see poor men paid of the poor men's box, vagabonds punished, parishes convincate, rood-lofts pulled down, monuments of superstition defaced, service said and heard, is Scripture, is statute. That the Oath to the Queen's Ma. should be offered and taken is required as well by the ordinance of God as of man. These are plain matters, necessary, Christian, and profitable. To wear a surplice, a cope, or a cornered cap, is (as you take it) an accidental thing, a device only of man, and, as we said, a doubt or question in Divinity. Sith now these substantial points are, in all places of this realm almost, neglected, the offenders either nothing or little rebuked ; and sith transgressors have no colour of conscience, it is sin and shame to proceed against us first, having also a reasonable defence of our doing. Charity, my lords, would first have taught us, equity would also have heard us, brotherliness would have warned us, pity would have pardoned us, if we had been found trespassers. God is my witness, who is the beholder of all faith, I think of your lordships honourably, esteeming you as brethren, reverencing you as lords and masters of the congregation. Alas, why have you not some opinion of us? Why do you trust known adversaries and mistrust your brethren? We confess one faith of Jesus Christ ; we preach one doctrine, we acknowledge one ruler in earth over all things. Saving of this we are of your judgment. Shall we be used so for a surplice? Shall brethren persecute brethren for a forked cap devised of singularity of him that is our foreign enemy? Now shall we fight for the Popish coat, his head and body being banished? Shall the controversy so fall out in conclusion that for lack of this unnecessary furniture, labourers shall lack wages, churches preachings? Shall we not teach? Shall we not exercise our talent as God hath commanded, because we will not receive that which the enemy hath devised, and that



Chapter of Christ Church is not recorded : but in the process something occurred on which he requested the intervention of Parker : and the Archbishop showed willing charity, the Dean the frankness of gratitude, in the three or four letters which indirectly record an obscure transaction.\* The Archbishop appears to have saved him from imprisonment, free custody, or limitation : and not to have prevented his further employment in the Church of England, nor his future promotion : † even now he ceased not to exhort him to

by the appointment of friends? Oh that ever I saw this day! that ever our adversaries should laugh to see brethren fall together by the ears! Oh that Ephraim should eat up Manasses and Manasses Ephraim! Oh my lords, before this take place, consider the cause of the Church, the cresses and triumphing of Antichrist, the laughter of Satan, the sorrow and sighs of a number, the misery and sequel of the tragedy. I write in zeal, without proof of my matters at this time present, but yet not without knowledge of it, nor without grief of mind. God move your spirits to fight against *carnem carnis circumcisione, imo concisione*, against *literam et legem*, which principally is now regarded and rewarded. Speak, I humbly beseech you, to the Queen's Ma., to our Chancellor, to Mr. Secretary, and to the rest, that those proceedings may sleep, that England may understand your zealous minds towards the special worship of God, your love to the poor well-willers, your hate towards our professed enemies, our unity in true Conformity, the other neither being needful now, neither exacted in any good age. So shall the little flock be bound to you; so shall the great Shepherd be good to you." This is endorsed "Ecclesiastical. A letter from Dr. Humphrey to the Bishops."—*S. P. Dom. Eliz.* vol. xxxvi. 64. It is entirely without date. In the Calendar it is conjecturally put to May, 1565 (p. 253). This may be. It is observable that Humphrey asks the Commissioners to plead with the Queen and the Secretary: the very persons from whom all the trouble sprang. The Nonconformists were blind from the first.

\* These letters are of June.—Parker's *Corresp.* 243 seq. They were first printed in Strype's *Parker*, vol. i. p. 371, not very correctly however.

† Strype says that Sampson and Humphrey were both put under confinement after their appearance before the Ecclesiastical Commission. Neal follows him. But it would rather appear that Parker saved them from any such molestation. Humphrey retired to a widow's house for a time, but of his own accord. It seems doubtful whether Sampson suffered any restriction. Neal makes a piteous story of him: "The storm fell chiefly upon Sampson, who was confined in prison a considerable time as a terror to others; and by special order from the Queen was deprived

conformity. He bade him "salve again the great offendicule risen by his dissent from the course of the Gospel : and reflect that the greater the liberty enjoyed the higher should be the obedience." "Remember," said he, "what obedience so great liberty of the whole doctrine of Christ granted requireth at our hands. I am persuaded that time and indifferent reading on your part will give cause to join again our communion : I mean not in doctrine, but in this matter of this ecclesiastical policy." Sampson on his side no less charitably prayed, "The Lord Jesus direct you by His mighty Spirit to do in your calling that best pleaseth Him." Upon the whole, deprivation was a stretch in law, and had little warrant otherwise : that Parker proceeded to such an extreme at once, with so eminent a man, proved his resolution more than it manifests his prudence.\*

of his deanery"; and never got any preferment afterwards "but the government of a poor hospital." Neal knew not that Sampson was afterwards not only Master of Wigston Hospital in Leicester, but lecturer in Whittington College in London, Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Rector of Brightlingsea in Essex. Neal says not a word of Parker's kind treatment of him, though Neal wrote with his Strype before him. And if Neal had really considered the places in Strype on which he has founded himself, he would not have said that Sampson was imprisoned. Strype says that "Sampson was not only deprived of his deanery, but of his liberty too ; being confined by the Queen's special commandment, who was very angry with these men, and thought good to make Sampson an example to the rest : yet not committed to a common prison, though that was feared to follow."—*Life of Parker*, 186. And again : "Upon his deprivation, which was executed by the Queen's Ecclesiastical Commissioners, he was restrained of his liberty too at London by her order, that he might be an example of her displeasure to the rest."—*Annals*, i. 477. Even this is more than is certain. It does not appear that Sampson suffered any restraint, either by being confined to a region, or sent to live with a bishop. If he was, it must have been in May : for in the beginning of June he is found asking Parker to mediate that he might not be, making no allusions to having been so treated.

\* Strype says that Sampson was deprived by a special order from the Queen. But that order has never been produced. The lawfulness of

Another part of the activity of Parker at this time, another strand in the complicated cable of his letters, was licenses to preach. About them he had considerable trouble, the occasion coming from that conformable University of which the Vice-Chancellor, a returned exile, had certified so assuredly. George Withers, a licensed preacher, wanted to smash the painted windows in the schools of Cambridge. Informed of his desire, the Archbishop required his license, which he examined with antiquarian skill, and discovered to be obsolete and defective, depending on an old Papal bull. He found that Withers was one of twelve that might be licensed in the University upon the same extinct authority, and then go preaching where they would, exempt from episcopal oversight: that in Oxford there were as many more exercising the like privilege, remnants of the Papal policy of depressing bishops: and that lax heads were filling these former Papal freeholds with extreme Nonconformists.\* He did

his deprivation was questioned by lawyers both at the time, as Parker's letter shows, and afterwards, as Strype tells us that some great common lawyer, in a discourse on Prohibitions in a volume in the Cotton Library, has observed that Christ Church is a donative, and that Sampson had it for life under the Great Seal; demanding to know by what authority he was deprived of it: that Bishop Barlow in the time of Edward the Sixth, having deprived the Dean of Wells of his donative deanery, was in a *præmunire*, and had to sue for pardon: that the fault in the one case was as much as in the other, if in law it be a lay thing, and the Ecclesiastical Commission was only to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction in ecclesiastical causes.—*Life of Parker*, 186.

\* Parker brought the case before Cecil as Chancellor of Cambridge, and pointed out to him as one irregularity of Withers' license, that Cecil's name was not prefixed, as it ought to have been according to the bull, or whatever the privilege was, by which power was granted to the Chancellor to license twelve preachers under the University seal. Parker's criticism is very acute. The bull was from Julian Bishop of Ostia to Bishop Fisher: this, he says, was "long ago dead": but he thought that "Bishop Rochester," meaning Fisher, would have had it made out in his name, and been careful for the worthiness of the person. Beaumont's predecessor as Vice-Chancellor, Hawford, had made out the licenses irregularly.



what he could to redress this evil : he had Withers up before him at Lambeth : where Withers appeared with the demeanour of a Cantabrigian or a Roman senator. He protested to Cecil that it was of no use for him to have refractory men before him unless he were better backed : that when they came and saw how the game went, they would be rendered the more refractory.\* Withers soon afterwards conformed.†

Moved to enquire more generally into the matter of licenses, the Archbishop found much to rectify. He himself had granted licenses to men whom he thought discreet, who had shown themselves indiscreet : and many of his brethren had done the same. He was informed (in what manner it appears not) that the Queen desired the bishops to take better heed of such as sued for licenses. He therefore wrote another letter to the Bishop of London, requiring him to signify also to the rest of the bishops of the province, that no

He thought it would be well to annul all such licenses : and have a form such as all the ordinaries used, with a saving clause as to behaviour, and not admit for life "hand over head without revocation." To Cecil, April 9, 1565.—*Corresp.* 238. The form of license issued by Fisher in accordance with the bull is printed in Strype's *Parker*, Bk. iii. Append. xxxv. It is interesting : it gives "licentiam et liberam facultatem imperpetuum eligendi singulis annis duodecim doctores seu magistros et graduatos in presbyteratus ordine constitutos . . . qui ubique per totum regnum Angliæ, Scotiæ et Hiberniæ populo et clero Verbum Dei prædicare et seminare possint," with the consent of the rectors of the churches, but "locorum Ordinariorum licentiâ super hoc minime requisitâ." Strype also gives the corresponding license of George Withers, which Parker scrutinised. It is of 1563. He also gives Queen Elizabeth's form of licensing : which is founded on the former, but omits the word "imperpetuum."—*Ib.* This form was evidently set forth after the agitation of the subject.

\* Parker to Cecil, March 8 and 12.—*Corresp.* pp. 234 and 236. Strype has given a full account of the case (and of the rest of the troubles at Cambridge), *Life of Parker*, Bk. iii. ch. iii.

† He was minister at Bury. The people there told him to put the square cap on, and not deprive them of his ministry for a trifle. He wrote to Parker a letter signifying his compliance.—Strype's *Parker*, i. 188.

preacher should be suffered to preach by virtue of one of his licenses that should be of older date than the last month, April, past : delicately hinting that the like revocation of former licenses would not be amiss on their part.\* But his requests seem to have been neglected, or scantily observed ; and for months afterwards Parker's licensed preachers were still infesting the country, "passing from church to church, preaching everywhere as if they were Apostles ; and requiring money for their labours by virtue of his Grace's seal." So Jewel of Salisbury informed him.†

Such explorations brought to light a deep tinge of Nonconformity in Cambridge. Some of the colleges were found to be full of Nonconformists ; some of the Heads were Nonconformist. The expectation of an edict or proclamation to enforce the Queen's mandate on the University, and the apparel and the surplice on the backs of the scholars, had the effect of wholly

\* Parker to Grindal, May 12, 1565.—Strype's *Parker*, Bk. iii. Append. xxxii. : or Parker's *Corresp.* 242. Strype gives a good account of this matter ; *Parker*, Bk. iii. ch. ii. There were other regulations made by Parker about licenses, about taking out new ones on easy terms, and about the other disorders of the clergy, in his letter to Grindal. Some who were not resident let out their benefices, or took sums of money for their leases from farmers, and then dishonestly departed from their places, thus defrauding their farmers. Strype attributes this to some of the Romanensians.

† Jewel to Parker, Dec. 22, 1565. Quoted by Strype (*Parker*, 189) from MS. C. C. C. civ. 160. Neal makes a tragedy of this : that men who had been discharged out of one diocese for Nonconformity, could not now get a settlement in another : and that as to their travelling like Apostles, they were Apostles in poverty : that to take money for their labours it was no "unpardonable crime that honest men of a liberal education, that had parted with their livings in the church for a good conscience, should endeavour after a very poor manner to live by the Gospel."—*Puritans*, 178. Most of this is imaginary. He says also that those Puritans who could not conscientiously take out new licenses binding them to conformity, kept their old ones, and used them. He also, very excusably, makes this regulation of licenses follow the publication of the Advertisements (as to which see next chapter).—*Ibid.* 177.

altering the tone which the Vice-Chancellor Beaumont had previously used to the Archbishop. He, and with him some other heads and magnates, addressed to Cecil, their Chancellor, a supplication against such a promulgation, lest their Academy should be deprived of a multitude of pious and learned men who in their conscience held all the apparel to be unlawful. "In the name of our brethren and countrymen we beseech you to lighten this dreaded burden, the imposition of which will, so far as we can see, be perilous to the preaching of the Gospel and the cause of letters." Two future archbishops were among the names appended to this petition: and, singular to relate, John Whitgift thus enters history in the cause of Nonconformity.\* This letter was ill taken. Cecil gave it a sharp answer, and it cost Beaumont a laborious explanation, and Whitgift an apology.† Cecil could do no other than chide: for it was not his plan to

\* November 26, 1565.—Strype's *Parker*, Bk. iii. ch. iii., and Append. No. xxxix. It was signed by Robt. Beaumont, Master of Trinity; Rog. Kelk, Master of Magdalen; Matt. Hutton, Master of Pembroke; Rd. Longworth, Master of St. John's; Jn. Whitgift, Fellow of Peterhouse, and Margaret Professor. Of these, Hutton rose to York, Whitgift to Canterbury.

† Beaumont explained that he set his name to it "to avoid a greater inconvenience": that two other very offensive letters had been written to the Queen and to Cecil: and this was instead of them. "Two sore and unseeming letters were drawn and written fair, whereunto many not of the gravest sort subscribed: and fearing lest the whole university should have suffered great displeasure, means were found that both were stayed, and a third with much mitigation written," &c.—*MS. State Pap. Dom. Eliz.* vol. xxxviii. No. 10 (*Cal.* p. 262). Whitgift sought to clear himself two years later. "As touching my Nonconformity, which is one thing laid against me, I dare be judged by my Lord of Canterbury, your Honour, or my Lord of London, or Master Dean of York, who knoweth more of my mind in this matter than any man doth beside. I never encouraged any to withstand the Queen's Majesty's laws in that behalf; but I both have and do, by all means I may, seek to persuade men to conform themselves: for it grieveth me that any man should cease from preaching for the use of these things, being of themselves indifferent." To Cecil, June, 1567.—Strype's *Whitgift*, Append. No. iv.



countenance Nonconformity outwardly or discourage Conformity; but to countenance Conformity outwardly and secretly to encourage Nonconformity. He was at the time seriously engaged in examining the state of the colleges of Cambridge.

Of one of these learned societies the intestine commotions, of which considerable relics remain, are not without interest or instruction: and the reader is invited to peruse the story of the growth of Nonconformity in the bosom of St. John's.\* The Master of this great college, Longworth, one of those who had signed Beaumont's petition to Cecil, was believed to connive at irregularity. He had snatched his own promotion, it was said, by violating the statutes: and he was corrupt and partial in his management. He took private rewards in the letting of leases; he took the college coal for his own firing; he appointed a bad and unlearned bursar, who defrauded the college of nine loads of coal. He had for his chief favourite a young man named Fulk, whom he had made a fellow without the consent of the fellows, a preacher of the college without a license to preach, and head lecturer contrary to the order appointed by the statutes. This Fulk, who afterwards became the well-known controversial writer, was the chief author of the Puritan "misorder" which the Master was held to foster. He set himself to innovate, to be singular and irregular, from the day of his appointment. He wore a hat instead of the square cap, and went about in a Turkey gown. He kept in his room conies, cats, dogs, and virginals: and to that various accompaniment he sang psalms with the boys of the college to light and wanton

\* Some of the documents relating to the Puritan struggle in St. John's have been given by Strype: but the greater part of them, which remain in the Record Office, have not been used hitherto in history.

tunes. He induced some other of the tutors to the like, singing the Geneva psalms with their pupils. He went birding with the boys "to the slander of the ministry." When punishments came to his turn, he remitted those of the youth whom he favoured, and was heavy on others, at times correcting grown men like boys, contrary to the statutes. By such arts he had the whole of the younger sort at his disposition, so that they neither dared nor would do anything but as he bade them. As to his sermons, they were the scandal or the admiration not only of the college but of the University. In the pulpit of St. Mary's he delivered a violent harangue against caps, gowns, and surplices, "most vehemently inveighing against such popish trumpery, as he then termed it, dehorting all men from the use of the same, whenas in no good sense they might be used among Christian men, and that the users thereof were reprobate and damned." When the Vice-Chancellor himself preached a sermon in St. Mary's on the morning of All Saints' Day of this year, gently reproving the rashness of private men in attempting public reformation as if they were magistrates, Fulk made an audacious reply in St. John's Chapel in the afternoon. The college sermons were termed "private" to distinguish them from others; or sometimes (it would appear) they were known as "commonplaces." Fulk made the college pulpit his proper throne. It was the custom of the Master to stand, often without surplice and hood, in a little gallery between his study and the chapel, to survey the gathered house and listen to the exuberant preacher. As Longworth was said never to study, and to discharge his own share of preaching so negligently as to disgust everybody, the power of Fulk's oratory was the greater over him. On one occasion Fulk demanded

in a sermon that the stairs at the upper end of the chapel should be removed, meaning perhaps the steps that had once led to the altar. It was done next day by order of the Master, though to the disturbance of the bones of one who lay buried beneath. Another time he inveighed against the unleavened bread ordered by the Queen's Injunctions, calling it starch and paste. Whereupon the Master commanded common bread to be brought in for the Communion which was then in hand to be ministered. Another time he vehemently assailed surplices, wishing that the devil might take them away, exclaiming, "Have I so often preached against the white coats, and will they never amend?" On this the Master came down out of his gallery without his surplice and received the Communion among the fellows having their surplices on. In another of his collations he raged against kneeling at the Holy Communion; whereupon some received standing, some sitting in their stalls, very few kneeling, "the minister going all along in his gown scantily with such reverence as holy bread was dealt in the popish time," while many through offence withdrew themselves from communicating. In another his subject was copes and surplices: after which for a time the ministration of Holy Communion was that either the priest had no surplice or the deacon had none; "but in fine they waxed so hot that they could abide no such garment upon them," either the one or the other. About that time the Master made him sacrist: in which capacity a fine collection of copes would have fallen to his charge. He refused to take the oath; that he would not have the custody of so wicked and ungodly things; and he and a few of the disordered fellows sold the copes among themselves at half the value, making "Robin Hood's pennyworths of them," being "them-



selves both merchants and chapmen"; whereby the college was endamaged to the loss of forty pounds, Fulk being "chief chapman and having the most gains."

The misorder reached its height about the middle of October, in the absence of the Master, who went away for a time, it was thought of set purpose. On Saturday, October 12, upon the first tolling of the bell for evening prayers, a number of the youths of the house rushed into the chapel without surplices, and hissed at those who came in after with their surplices on: so that these were forced to retire, and either miss the service or come back without surplices. The Master, on his return home, commended these vigorous reformers in an address which he made in open assembly in the hall, and appeared to range himself and his college definitely among the Nonconformists. "We are in this our doing singular," said he, "and therefore shall be seen to have many that will be glad to find fault with us: yet I do not doubt but that God will maintain us in our singularity, having the right on our part." He also laboured the Masters of Arts of the college to subscribe to a supplication to the Queen, that if the matter of surplices were forced, four hundred of the forwardest scholars in the town would lose their livings. But this was rejected as manifestly untrue.

This Nonconforming faction was steadily opposed by the senior fellows, headed by Richard Coortesse, the President. After manifold contentions, these Conformists invoked Cecil, the Chancellor of the University, in a petition that he would summon the Master and Fulk before him for examination. They sent him a set of Articles accusatory against them: and after the crowning scene in the chapel they sent a

second set.\* Cecil was slow. Longworth seemed indifferent, and was heard to say that he knew the mind of the Chancellor better than any in the house. At length Cecil summoned him to London; and Fulk also. But anon distressing rumours reached Cambridge that the President and the fellows "had the check" in London: and that the Master had been entertained very favourably not only by Cecil but by the indulgent Bishop of London. Cecil however drew up an easy form of retraction, in which Longworth denied that he had of set purpose ever broken any ordinance, though in his absence some innovations had been made, which he had allowed to continue, of no ill intent, promising conformity in the future. This Longworth signed in his presence, December 13, under the condition of reading it before the college on his return. On his return he wore an air of triumph, and carried off the retraction in a magisterial manner. He took his time about it. Before thinking of reading it he sent a friendly letter to Cecil, December 18, describing how he had now persuaded many to wear their surplices and follow the Queen's Injunctions, asking however whether he himself might as yet preach to the house only, in the chapel, without the surplice, and whether they might not retain the common bread in the ministration of Holy Communion. He followed this, two days later, by another letter, how that by gentle means nearly all the house were in their surplices in chapel, whereas if he had thundered and threatened loss of livings and expulsion (as Cecil would have had him promise to do, it seems, in the

\* These Articles are the chief source of the narrative that I have laid before the reader. They are voluminous, and contain much that I have not given. They are in vol. xxxviii. of the *State Pap. Dom. Eliz. MSS.* in the Record Office.

retractation) he would have done no good. "I have ministered such salve and sovereign medicine as in a very short space hath exceedingly healed the wound. Content shall I be on festival days to place myself in that little gallery adjoining my study, and there behold how every one doth order and use himself in time of Common Prayer." After a deliberation of three weeks, he read his retractation at the end of supper in the hall, December 28 ; but he read it not as Cecil had given it, but omitting some of the severer expressions, and inserting some softness.\* He also interjected certain "parentheses" in reading, which showed an untroubled mind: as, "I would I could as well answer for you as I did for myself": and "Mr. Secretary took not the letters sent him from you so heavily as some would have you in hand he would": and "Ye must not think that ye shall hereafter so boldly talk in assemblies as heretofore ye have done": with other such. So the indignant Coortesse informed

\* Strype has given the retractation as Cecil prescribed it, and the alterations which Longworth made in reading it. The parts in which the latter are found may be given here. What Longworth added or substituted is in brackets, what he omitted is in italics. "I did suffer the innovations to continue without either compelling (or reprehending of them, for I had not authority so to do) . . . or without complaining to any superior magistrate for the reformation thereof, *as in duty I now know I ought: and therefore I do acknowledge myself in that behalf the more faulty.*"—"And to permit *none* (neither fellow nor scholar) to continue in the former offence."—"To attempt any innovation contrary to the laws of the realm, Injunctions of her Majesty, *or the statutes or orders of the University*, or the foresaid college."—"I will from henceforth do my uttermost *in all mine own actions public and private* to observe and keep all manner of laws to which I am bound as master of that college *or graduate in the University*, as other masters *and graduates* have usually done."—"I will do my utmost to *compel* (cause) all manner of fellows (and) scholars *and students* within the said college."—"I promise *to do mine uttermost* to punish them: *and if their desert shall so require to expel them out of the said house.*"—*Life of Parker*, Bk. iii. App. No. xlii.



Cecil.\* For the President Coortesse, a consistent and resolute man, wrote to Cecil giving a different recital of Longworth's behaviour after his return from London, admitting indeed the general conformity of the house in surplices, but not attributing it to Longworth's healing salve and sovereign medicine, but rather to measures taken while Longworth and Fulk were away.† Indeed he furnished Cecil with another set of Articles against the Master: that he was upsetting all that had been done, picking quarrels, finding fault, and giving ridiculous orders from his little gallery in the chapel. He called upon the Chancellor "clearly to extinguish" the heat of discord, which, "if it be smothered for the present by fair words, will no doubt burst out into a most perilous flame."‡ But this lay not in Cecil's power.

Cecil, it is probable, conceived that he had discharged his office fully: nor had he not so far as words went; and beyond words he had no authority as yet to go, even if he had desired. He was the last man to step upon unsafe ground. He had spoken strongly. On first hearing of the troubles, he charged the Nonconformists of St. John's with vainglory, contempt of laws, affectation of popularity: setting at naught their plea of conscience, and of zeal for true and pure worship. As the disaffection spread to other colleges, especially Trinity, he wrote to the Vice-Chancellor, Beaumont, still more severely, terming this Noncon-

\* Articles against Longworth since his return.—*MSS. Dom. Eliz.* vol. xxxviii. No. 29; December 31, 1565.

† In fact, during Longworth's absence, Cecil wrote to Coortesse, to the Bishop of Ely, and to Stoke who had succeeded Beaumont as Vice-Chancellor, ordering them to take the opportunity of insisting upon conformity.—*MSS. Dom.* xxxviii. 13; December 13, 1565.

‡ Coortesse to Cecil, December 17, 1565; *MSS. Dom.* xxxviii. 16; and Articles against Longworth, December 31, as aforesaid.

formity a wilful breaking of common order, a lewd leprosy of libertines : requiring him to call together the heads, and acquaint them with his hearty desire that they would continue to observe uniformity in those external things which were of no other value than to demonstrate obedience, and render a testimony of unity. He recommended that preachers who had railed against such things should be inhibited for a time from preaching and lecturing. He caused the Bishop of Ely, Cox, who was Visitor of St. John's, to aid in restoring order : and Cox bore a great part in the searching of the colleges. He received indignant vindications from several houses. King's College sent him a declaration of Conformity signed by eleven of the fellows. Bartholomew Clark, of King's, denounced to him the trivial janglings of men who might be good and religious otherwise, but were "cap and surplice fanatics," unjust, ungrateful, who had cast an infamy on the University. Peterhouse, the college of Cox, particularly vindicated itself to him.\*

But Archbishop Parker was not satisfied with Cecil. He had already begun his bitter experience of equipoise, the Elizabethan, the Cecilian method, which wrought great things for England in many ways, but in the Nonconformist struggle produced endless disappointment, misery, and calamity. The business of Cambridge was brought before him by Cecil, and it would appear that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners were caused to act officially, to write letters concerning it. Parker remarked that the letters were not sent to the University but to the colleges, or to some of them, privately or separately.† He spoke plainly to Cecil :

\* Strype, *Annals*, i. 478-83.

† "I do not like that the Commissioners' letters should go to private colleges, specially after so much passed."—Parker's *Corresp.* 246.

"The best sort and the most part you have ready to execute your orders," he wrote, "excepting a few Catilines. If you, in such place and credit as ye be, will suffer so much authority to be borne under foot by a bragging, brainless head or two, your conscience shall never be excusable. We mar our religion; our circumspections so variable, as if it were not God's cause, which He will defend. Execution, execution, execution of laws and orders must be the first and last part of good government, although I admit moderations for times, places, or multitudes. And hereafter, for the love of God, never stir any alteration except it be meant to have them fully established: for else we shall hold us in no certainty, but be ridiculous to our adversaries."\* Cecil received this fiery admonition with equanimity.

In the first part of the year (to recede a little) the excellent Bentham had been accused "from above" of laxity, and the clergy of Coventry and Lichfield of disorder and dislike of the habits and other things enjoined. He responded to the stroke of the Metropolitan by appointing a Visitation to be held: of which the Articles and Injunctions, most of them hitherto unpublished, deserve consideration for the light which they throw on some features of the time.† We may

\* Parker's *Corresp.* 246. This letter is conjecturally put to December 8, 1565, by the editor of the *Correspondence*. I suspect it to be of the following year: but it may as well come here.

† Strype has printed the instructions which Bishop Bentham wrote for the guidance of his representative in making this Visitation, *Annals*, i. 501: but he has not printed the curious Injunctions to the parsons, vicars, curates, and churchwardens of the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield, which follow in another hand. It may be well to give them in full. "1. That your altars be clean taken away, and no monument of them left. But instead thereof ye do erect a decent and simple table upon a frame covered with a fair carpet, and a fine linen table-cloth upon it, in as beautiful manner as it was being upon the altar: and see that you set up the table of the Commandments on the place where the Sacra-



gather from them that the age of confirmation was below that which is now usual : that the reason why the tables of the Ten Commandments were put on the

ment was hung, with other godly sentences lately set forth. 2. Item, that ye call upon the people daily that they cast away their beads with all other superstitions that they did use praying upon them, and to follow the right use of prayer, which doth consist in lifting up the mind unto Almighty God, calling for mercy and grace, and not in numbering of their beads, prating with their lips, their hearts and minds in the meantime being occupied about their worldly business. 3. Item, that you daily resort unto your church, and devoutly say such divine service as is set forth in the Book of Common Prayer, both at Evening and Morning ; and that you knoll a bell before you go unto it. 4. Item, that you daily call upon the people to come to the church upon the Sabbath day in due time, and there to occupy themselves in devout prayers in the time of divine service, and not to walk up and down in the church, nor to jangle, babble, and talk in service time, but to give diligent attendance unto the priest when he readeth lessons, homilies, the Epistle or Gospel, or something else which tendeth unto edifying. 5. Item, that you cast away your Mass books, your Portuises, and all other books of Latin service ; and that you use none other service neither apertly nor openly but that is set forth in the Book of Common Prayer, and in any wise away with your lights at the burial of the dead : and instead thereof exhort them duly to receive the light of the Gospel, which is the true light which illumines every man, &c. 6. Item, that ye observe diligently the Queen's Majesty's Injunctions, and namely the Injunction of teaching children the Catechism on the Sundays and holydays from the first peal to evensong until they ring all in for the space of an hour : and if you cannot bring the youth of the parish to the church before evensong, then see that you cause the children to rehearse the same every Sunday and holyday immediately after the first lesson, straitly charging all people to give diligent attendance unto the same. 7. Item, that you leave haunting of alehouses, at all times spending your time in godly exercises, in prayer, study, reading of Holy Scripture, bringing the youth in good literature, civil manners, and good custom, teaching them daily to increase in knowledge, fear, and love of God, to be obedient to their parents and elders, and to render them withal humility and meekness. 8. Item, that you do say your divine service on the holydays distinctly with an audible voice, that the people may understand you, and specially when you read the Homilies, the Epistle, or Gospel, and all manner of prayers said at the Holy Communion, and not to mumble nor stumble all things without devotion, as you did when you had the service in the Latin tongue. 9. Item, that you do not innovate, alter, nor change any rite or ceremony about the celebration of the Holy Communion otherwise than is set forth in the Book of Common Prayer ; and that you do not

east wall in churches was that they might take the place of the pix, and crests and armorial bearings were set over chancel-arches to take the place of roods : that

make the Communion a Mass of requiem for lucre and gain persuading the people to pray for the dead, but rather call upon them daily to live godly here in this life, and that they do good, as St. Paul saith, while they have time, for the night cometh, saith Christ, wherein no man can work. 10. Item, that you celebrate the Holy Communion the first Sunday of every month ; and then where the parish is great, the sixth part thereof to receive that day, or at the least within the same month : and if the parish be not above four hundred houseling people, the fourth part of the parish to receive orderly, as they were wont to pay the holy loaf : so doing they shall receive four times in the year, according to the order set forth in the Book of Common Prayer. 11. Item, forasmuch as fornication is not to be named amongst you, as it becometh saints, we charge and command that you keep no woman in your houses, except she be your wife, your sister, your aunt, or your near kinswoman or women, above the age of fifty years, under pain of contempt. 12. Item, that we charge and command all parsons, vicars, and curates, upon pain of sequestration of their fruits, that either they of their own proper persons do preach every quarter once in their church at the least, according to the Q. M. Injunctions, or else to contribute yearly to the maintaining of a preacher eightpence in the pound of the clear value of their benefices ; the tenth, subsidy, and other ordinary charges deducted. 13. Item, we charge and command that every parson, vicar, and curate shall with the help of the churchwardens choose in their parish eight, six, or four at the least of the most substantial and honest men in the parish, who being charged upon their corporal oaths, and having white rods in their hands, shall have authority to see good order kept in the church : they shall first gently admonish them, and if they will not be reformed so, then two of the honestest men aforesaid shall lead them up unto the chancel door, and set them with their faces looking down towards the people for the space of one quarter of an hour. 14. Item, they shall note and mark diligently those that do accustomedly absent themselves from the church, and after one monition had, if they do not amend, to punish them according to the statute, that is, to pay twelve pence to the poor man's box as often as they be absent and cannot show a just cause of their absence. 15. Item, they shall diligently see that no alewife sell any ale or beer, or keep any tippling in the time of service, or if any resort to the alehouse either before service or in time of divine service, two or more of the said honest men aforesaid shall bring them to the church, and shall set them at the chancel door, as is aforesaid. 16. Item, they shall diligently note and mark them that wear any beads ; and if they will not put them away without monition, so often as they take them after with any to pay for every time twelve pence to pay (*sic*) to the poor man's

Latin service-books were still abroad ; and old usages, such as beads and lights at the burial of the dead, still lingered : that once a month was the perfection to be sought in celebration, four times a year in reception, of the Holy Communion : that for remedy of bad be-

box, and if any resistance be made by any man concerning the premises, complaint to be made to the ordinary, or in his absence to his deputy, that redress may be had by-and-by. 17. Item, that ye call upon your parishioners straitly charging them that they set not down the corpse of any dead body by any cross by the way, as they bring it to the burial, nor let any man, woman, or child say *De Profundis* or the Lord's Prayer for the dead, but rather that they do praise God with thanksgiving, for that it hath pleased Him of His infinite mercy and goodness to call their brother or sister out of this worldly misery unto the joys everlasting. 18. Item, that you do read the Declaration twice every year at the days appointed for the same, that is, the next Sunday after Michaelmas, and the next Sunday after Easter. 19. Item, that ye charge all manner of artificers, butchers, victuallers, that they keep no market upon Sundays or holidays upon pain of excommunication, and if they will not obey you, then forthwith to present them to the ordinary, that reformation may be had therein. 20. Item, that ye do present unto your dean all fornicators and adulterers that may be found within your parish every quarter once when he shall sit at any church within the deanery calling you before him for the same purpose. 21. Item, that you do take down your roodlofts unto the lower beams, and to set a comely crest or vault upon it according to the Queen's Majesty's Injunctions set forth for the same : and that you do abolish and put away clean out of your church all monuments of idolatry and superstition, as holy-water stocks, sepulchres, which were used on Good Friday, handbells, and all manner of idols which be laid up in secret places in your church where Latin service was used : and all manner of books that were used in the church : and that you beat down all manner of stones or blocks whereupon images were set ; and that you do amince up all manner of hollow places in your chancel or church wall, and that you do whitelime your church, and make it decent and fair. 22. Item, that you do not superstitiously keep holy such days as be abrogated by the laws of this realm, but that you do call upon the people to occupy themselves on such days in their honest labour, and exercise every man as he is called, and that you do not put the people in remembrance of any such at the bidding of your holidays. 23. Item, that you suffer no ringing of bells for the dead, but only to knoll a bell at the hour of death for the space of half an hour and to ring one short peal a little before the burial. 24. Item, we charge and command you that you have in your Church a Bible of the greatest volume, a Paraphrasis, the Book of Common Prayer, a Psalter, the Queen's Majesty's Injunctions, the Declaration, the Tomes of Homilies, on this side the Feast of



haviour in church during service, substantial champions, white rods, vigorous seizure, the chancel door, and exposure there to shame of face, were recommended.

The same month that saw Turberville and Pate discharged from the liberal custody of bishops,\* beheld Watson, the most powerful of the insuperable cohort, returned by order of the Council from the palace of Ely to the rigours of the Tower. Of his intercourse with Cox, his later guardian (the former was Grindal, with whom we have seen that he refused to confer), nothing is known: but it is probable that he exerted himself to assist and encourage the Romanensians round about in resisting the new religion, the English Service. Cox was ordered to send him under safe-conduct to the Tower; where he was kept "without conference with any," and remained some years.† A month afterwards the Tower received another Papal prisoner, an Irish ecclesiastic, Richard Creagh, who, at Rome, at the consistory held at Easter in the former year, 1564, had been appointed to the arch-see of Armagh, and consecrated by the Pope.‡ This

St. Michael the Archangel next ensuing. 25. Item, that you keep your church in good reparation from rain and weather, and that you do make it fair and clean with whitelime, and to see your churchyard well fenced, and that no swine nor other cattle be in it and defile it."—*S. P. Dom.* xxxvi. 41.

\* See Vol. V. ch. xxxiv. of this work.

† "A letter to the Bishop of Ely to send under safe custody Doctor Watson, heretofore committed to his custody, to the Tower of London. A letter to the Lieutenant of the Tower to receive him and keep him in safe ward without having conference with any."—*Acts of the Council*, Jan. 9, 1565; Dasent, p. 183.

‡ Creagh was appointed to Armagh in the consistory held March 23, 1564; and consecrated by the Pope that Easter. This date might be supposed sufficient to have destroyed the story of Sanders or Rishton, and other retailers of the Nag's Head fable, that, before stooping to ask Barlow, recourse was had to an Irish archbishop, imprisoned in London, to consecrate Parker to Canterbury; and that this Irish archbishop was importuned to officiate, with promises of liberty and reward. But the story is retained in the modern translation of Sanders, a per-

Irish primate, proceeding to his seat of dominion, was apprehended "for attempting to disturb the state of the realm of Ireland by practices from Rome," sent to England, and now committed to the close prison of the Tower.\* He was examined several times in prison, and made full disclosures: that he had letters from the Pope to O'Nial: that he had been entertained on his journey by the Cardinal of Augsburg: that a Papal Nuncio had been in Ireland in the previous summer.† He bore a commission from the Pope appointing him archbishop and metropolitan, the rest of the prelates of Ireland being retained as suffragans: and he had power to proceed against those who disobeyed him, and against those of that country who refused to submit to the Apostolic See.‡ For the rest of his history, he supplicated the liberty of the Tower: from which he presently escaped, and was at large two years:§ he passed into Ireland, and formance in which many of Sanders' assertions are silently dropped. Parker was consecrated six years before the Irish archbishop.

\* "One Richard Creagh, of the realm of Ireland, for attempting to disturb the state of the realm of Ireland by practices from Rome, was this day committed to the close prison of the Tower; and letters to the Lieutenant to keep him in safe ward without conference with any until he shall be further examined." Feb. 22, 1565.—*Acts of Council*, Dasent, 198. This was the "nebulo" of whom Bishop Jewel exultingly wrote, "In illam insulam Papa ante aliquot admodum dies immisit hominem sceleratum et callidum cum mandatis, qui huc illuc concursaret. Erat enim Hibernus, qui gentem feram et silvestrem contra nos religionis causa commoveret. Quid quæris? Nebulo statim primo appulso comprehenditur, et excussus et vinctus ad nos mittitur." To Bullinger, March 1, 1565.—*Zurich Lett.* lxiii.

† This Nuncio was a man of Limerick named David Wolf. He had been in Tyrone with Shane O'Nial the last summer.—Hamilton's *Cal. of Irish St. Pap.*, 255.

‡ Questions by Cecil with Creagh's answers, Feb. 22, 1565.—*Ib.* p. 253. There is an Order of Council of March 9 for his further examination, and another of March 11, in Dasent's *Acts*: and Creagh's Answers, Mar. 17 and 23, are in Hamilton's *Cal.* p. 255. Compare the account given by the Spanish ambassador, *Span. Cal.* 404.

§ Creagh's Supplication for the liberty of the Tower.—*Irish State Pap.*

was soon involved again in his former practices, till he was caught and sent back to England, and lodged in the Gatehouse in Westminster; whence he was transferred to his former prison, and died in the Tower after an incarceration of nearly twenty years. This man "of the realm of Ireland" was treated more severely than the Romanensian prelates of the realm of England: but moral depravity disarms pity.\* He was the titular head of a titular hierarchy, which in him began to vex the Church of Ireland forthwith. There was Thomas O'Herlichy, the titular Bishop of Ross in Carbery, and Maurice Macgibbon, the titular Bishop of Cashel, who held dangerous converse with Spain, whither they withdrew themselves, or were driven by the myrmidons of a ruthless government.† There was David, the titular Bishop of Emly, who was caught at Dartmoor, on the Saxon shores, and compelled to appear before the Council of the Queen of Ireland

256. His escape from the Tower, which was soon after his request for the liberty of the Tower, seems to have been as easy as unaccountable. "On Low Sunday (April 28, 1565) an Irish bishop of Ireland, being prisoner in the Tower of London, went quietly from thence, being seen and spoken with at his so going, and yet not known; which was much to be marvelled at, but he could not be found."—Stow's *Memoranda*, 132. He was apprehended in Ireland, April 30, 1567.—*Irish State Pap. Cal.* 334. He was put in the Westminster Gatehouse, and thence returned to the close prison of the Tower in 1574, and again examined upon articles. Dasent's *Acts*, viii. 351-3. About the same time an Irishman, Patrick Segrave, repairing to Rome, "practised to procure the liberty of Creagh," was caught in these islands, brought before the Council, and dismissed under sureties "with some good lessons."—*Ib.* ix. 7.

\* There are some entries in the *Acts of the Privy Council* concerning a very shocking charge against Creagh, for an offence committed in the Tower. It may be noticed that the papistical doings in Ireland were not to the liking of the King of Spain. "With regard to the negotiations opened by the Irish Catholics, you will cut them short gently, as they are not desirable. They have tried the same thing before with the same result." Philip to Guzman, Aug. 1564.—*Span. Cal.* 370.

† Hamilton's *Irish Cal.* 394, 401, 443.



in Westminster.\* There was Milerus, that is, Meyler Magrath, the titular Bishop of Down, a former friar, who was not faithful to the power that consecrated him. He too was caught in the larger island, and barbarously committed to the free custody of the Bishop of London: and Milerus entirely submitted himself to the Queen and Council; professed himself ready to sacrifice his own brother as a hostage under penalty of death that he might obtain his own freedom; was sent back to Ireland, having had an ague; and recovered his bishopric from the Crown by the threat of falling into a new fever if he were detained.† He made havoc of his see by sales and bargains. These titulars were trouble from which the sister Church of England has been exempt until the present age.

About this time and in the succeeding years the Irish sees were so wasted by their bishops as to demand the intervention of the Viceroy, which was given to little purpose. Thonory, Bishop of Ossory, leased away his manors at inconsiderable rents: Craike of Kildare exchanged nearly all his manors for little tithes, reducing a most venerable bishopric to shameful poverty: Allen of Ferns a lustre or two later, Cavenagh of Leighlin, and Linch of Elphin, made scandalous waste and alienations: but they were equalled or surpassed by others: insomuch that some of their successors could count their revenues most conveniently in shillings or marks. The Elizabethan Primate

\* "A letter to Sir Arthur Champernon of thanks for his diligence used in the examination and apprehension of one David — naming himself Bishop of Emly in Ireland, whom he is willed to send up hither under safe custody, to the intent his intention in going forth of his country may the better be discovered."—*Acts of Council*, 273 (Dasent).

† Strype's *Grindal*, 140; Grindal's *Remains*, 307; Hamilton's *Irish Cal.* 334, 337, 341, 354, 429.

Loftus, vacating Armagh for Dublin on account of the ruined state of that part of the country, was compelled to get a license to hold a sinecure along with his beggarly arch-see. Lancaster, his successor in Armagh, got a license, though Armagh was richer than Dublin, to retain all his commendams in England and Ireland, so as to be competent. Brady of Meath was granted by the Government five years to pay his first-fruits, so poor was Meath. Poverty compelled unions. Meath was united to Clonmacnoise: Emly to Cashel: and two old sees were conjoined in Kerry. Most of the Elizabethan bishops were Irishmen: twenty-eight out of about forty that she made in her reign. They abused the patronage of their cathedral churches so deplorably that the presentation of such dignities was resumed by the Lord Deputy for ten years. The state of the clergy may be imagined. "As for religion, there was but small appearance of it: the churches uncovered, and the clergy scattered, and scarce the being of a God known to those ignorant and barbarous people."\* The deputies and the Parliaments made excellent decrees and laws from time to time: but they were mere paper. There was little power or mind to do anything. The Crown was among the chief oppressors of the Church. Archbishop Loftus represented to Cecil that the greatest number of the benefices within the pale were impropriated to the Queen, and farmed out to persons who had no care for the cure, praying her Majesty to quit some part of her impropriations for the maintenance of the ministry, who were in a wretched condition, scarce any being preachers.† The efforts of a few

\* Report of the Irish Council to the Lord Deputy, 1565.—Mant's *Hist. of the Ch. of Ireland*, p. 288.

† Collier, vi. 491.

good men shed a ray through the general darkness : and the name of Walsh, the Chancellor of St. Patrick's, afterwards Bishop of Ossory, ought to be had in honour. He, with John Kerney, the treasurer of the church, and Nehemiah Donellan, afterwards Archbishop of Tuam, was the first who struck Irish types for printing, obtained from the Government an order for printing the Prayers of the Church in that character and language, and for appointing a church in the shire town of every diocese where they should be read and a sermon preached to the people. He and his companions were proceeding with a translation of the New Testament into Irish, when he was surprised in his house and stabbed to the heart by an Irish dagger.\*

"So strong is the hope that is born of desires, that men are depressed to tears or transported with joy by insignificant events." The Spanish ambassador crowned with this reflection the account which he sent his master of the severe check or rebuke which the Queen administered to Dean Nowell, when he preached before her on the Ash Wednesday of this year.† A splendid tournament, a supper, and a ball, Leicester's entertainment of her Majesty, concluded the previous evening : and in the morning the Court repaired to Westminster, where they met the Archbishop and the other bishops and doctors of the Ecclesiastical Commission, and a great concourse of people.‡ The preacher, the learned and controversial Dean of St. Paul's, who had ere now smitten in the pulpit one of Harding's books against Jewel, took the occasion to make "a transition" from his subject

\* Most of the facts in this sketch are to be found in Mant's *History*.

† De Silva to Philip, March 12, 1565.—*Span. Cal.* 405.

‡ Strype's *Parker*, i. p. 318 ; Stow's *Memoranda*, p. 132.



to assail Marshal's *Treatise of the Cross*,\* denouncing, amid the frowns and murmurs of many of the audience, the impudency and ignorance of the writer, and complaining of the favourable reception which it had in England. He was proceeding to inveigh against images and idolatry, when the Queen called to him, "Do not talk about that." Not hearing her, he went on: whereupon she raised her voice and said pointedly, "Leave that: it has nothing to do with your subject, and the matter is now threadbare." The preacher was confused, spoke a few words more, and descended from the pulpit: the Queen left the place apparently in anger: some of the Evangelics were moved to tears, while the Romanensians gave token of exultant joy.† A change was seen, or imagined thenceforth, in the demeanour of preachers not only before the Queen but elsewhere.‡ Parker, who probably discerned in the ebullition not only the balances poised between Evangelics and Romanensians, but a cunning public disavowal of himself and his fellow-labourers in Conformity, took the preacher home with him to dinner "out of pure pity," finding him "utterly dismayed," as he said.§ But Nowell had spirit enough

\* I think that the Romanensian book that Nowell attacked may be identified as Marshal's *Treatise of the Cross*. Nowell spoke of a book dedicated to the Queen: and Marshal's *Treatise* was dedicated to the Queen. See Calfhill's *Answer* to it, p. 5, Park. Soc. Nowell further spoke of it as dedicated by the author "to his most gracious Sovereign" (see his remonstrance to Cecil, note p. 88). It cannot therefore have been the other book that was notoriously dedicated to the Queen, Osorius' *Letter*: for the Queen was not Osorius' sovereign.

† *Sp. Calend.* 405.

‡ "The preachers to the Queen have greatly modified their sermons, and their example is followed elsewhere since the scene which I described to your Majesty on a former occasion." De Silva to Philip, Ap. 14, 1565.—*Ib.* 418.

§ "For pure pity I took home to dinner with me Mr. Dean of Paul's yesterday: he was utterly dismayed." Parker to Cecil, March 8.—*Corresp.* 235.

to write to Cecil a becoming remonstrance against his treatment;\* and dignity enough to excuse himself from preaching before the Queen again in the Lent of the following year. At this time the balances hung so even to distant view, that it was rumoured that Elizabeth was seeking the Papal confirmation of all spiritual promotions that she had granted from her accession, on condition of the revocation of the Bull of her illegitimacy.†

\* In this he says, "The very occasion of my speaking yesterday against the Book of late dedicate to her Majesty was the unreverent impudency of the Author thereof, not abashing to dedicate so lewd a book to so learned a prince, and what is more a book so dishonest in many places of it to his most gracious sovereign." He laments that such a book should be "so liked of some (as I think) indiscreet subjects": and affirms that whatever error he committed in utterance, he "enjoyed the testimonies of sound doctrine recorded in the Scriptures and doctors, and the conscience of a good intent." He adds, as to his sermon, "My transition was from Dame Grace's books burned to images termed the books of idiots: which I took as not altogether impertinent." To Cecil, March 8.—Strype's *Parker*, Bk. ii. Append. No. xxix.

† Warner to Cecil, The Spa, Aug. 1565.—Addenda *State Pap. Eliz.* p. 571.

## CHAPTER XXXVIII.

1566.

THE delayed but inevitable date, at which the Non-conformists of the Church of England were compelled by the Conformists, was now at hand. Sampson was but the first of others. The limit of the compulsion that might be applied lawfully it might be difficult to ascertain; in him it had been carried at once to deprivation. But it may be observed that when the friends of Uniformity carried it to deprivation in his case or in subsequent cases, they proceeded very far. Certainly the position in which the Ecclesiastical Commission was placed by the Court was embarrassing; the whole matter was most provoking, a storm, it seemed, about nothing, when unity and fellowship in the Gospel might have been expected: such reflections struck some heat, especially in Parker: and there never was a time when absolute discretion was more needful.

The year that holds this date was opened by the blunt and pertinent question, addressed to Cecil by Beaumont, the Master of Trinity in Cambridge, whether he could deprive a man for not wearing his surplice.\* It was hard to answer this question affir-

\* "It is demanded of Mr. Beaumont, who is very diligent in observing the order prescribed by your Honour, by what authority he can for not wearing of a surplice deprive any man of his living." Wells to Cecil, Jan. 20, 1566.—*State Pap. Dom. Eliz.* vol. xxxix. 14.



matively upon the express words of any law. Such penalty was not attached to vestiary disobedience in the Queen's Injunctions, save a general clause.\* The case lay within the Act of Uniformity only by interpretation:† indeed it had arisen since the Act, and

\* In the Injunctions (Item 30) ministers are bidden wear "such seemly habits, garments, and such square caps, as were most commonly and orderly received in the latter year of the reign of King Edward VI.: not meaning thereby to attribute any holiness or special worthiness to the said garments, but as St. Paul writeth, *Omnia decenter et secundum ordinem fiant*." It is not till the ratification at the end of the code that the general order is found to observe all the Injunctions "upon pain of deprivation, sequestration of fruits and benefices, suspension, excommunication, and such other coercion" as the ordinaries or the Ecclesiastical Commissioners should see fit.

† The Act for Uniformity, 1 Eliz. c. 2, in the place near the end where it ordered the ornaments of ministers to be those in use in the second year of Edward VI., assigned no penalty to transgressors. See before, ch. xxxii. p. 99 of Vol. V. And in the next clause, where penalties would be expected to follow, as they do in corresponding clauses in other parts of the Act, it is only said, "And also, that if there shall happen any contempt or irreverence to be used in the ceremonies or rites of the Church, by the misusing of the orders appointed in this Book (of Common Prayer), the Queen's Majesty may, by the like advice of the said Commissioners (for Ecclesiastical Causes) or Metropolitan, ordain and publish such further ceremonies or rites as may be most for the advancement of God's glory, the edifying of His Church, and the due reverence of Christ's holy mysteries and sacraments." The case of ceremonial and ritual Nonconformity, then, appears to have been reserved for special treatment to follow: and it was only by including this sort of Nonconformity by implication in the general purport of the Act, under the words "in such order and form," that deprivation could be applied to it. The Act said that all ministers should "say and use" the services of the Prayer Book "in such order and form" as was mentioned in the Book; and that if any minister should "wilfully and obstinately use any other rite, ceremony, order, form, or manner," or should deprave the Book, he should for the second offence be imprisoned "and also deprived *ipso facto* of all his spiritual promotions." This seems directed against altering the service in reading, as by leaving out or putting in anything: not against omission of garments or ornaments, which would not amount to using another rite. It is to be observed that the Act fell back on the detestable Roman *ipso facto* system, which had formerly worked so discredibly in Excommunication. It may be added that the power of depriving was not inherent in the Ecclesiastical Commissioners themselves. No such power was granted them in their Commission.

was a new case, a new trouble, involving no doubt constant irritation, open challenge, and recurring defiance of authority. It is little to be wondered that some sharp measures were taken by the hierarchs, part of whose office it was to maintain the noble conception of a national Church remaining in an antiquity that lengthened every year; to demonstrate the sensitiveness of the whole body; to rejoice or be afflicted in all; and not to suffer the wilful selfishness of one part to make another ache. They could not accept the invitation to let alone and be let alone; because they could not be let alone in acts that touched and concerned them in their extensive jurisdiction. By these convictions the more zealous of them were guided in this business: others of them held that the essential unity of their communion, which they were equally anxious to maintain, lay at a deeper level. Neither the one part nor the other could foreknow all that was enwrapped in the difference between them: but the instinct that determines immediately the conduct of men has in it the nature of prophecy. Compulsion, like persecution, her near sister, is a peril. It must be entirely successful, or it is unsuccessful.

Upon Archbishop Parker the necessity of action pressed doubly, for that he was empowered by the Act for Uniformity both as Metropolitan and as Ecclesiastical Commissioner. He had kept his Articles or Ordinances by him for a year, after receiving them back from Cecil.\* He now sent them again to Cecil with a stern and indignant letter: that in endeavouring to enforce the Queen's pleasure on all his brethren, and to stop secret aiding and comforting, he found his service defeated: that he had stayed his proceedings on being advised of the state of the times and the

\* Above, p. 54.

discouragement of some good Protestants,\* if the order were vehemently pressed : but that he always perceived the hurt of such tolerations, and could not see but that the disorder might as soon be reformed in the case of clergy as in the apparel of other men and in abstinence, where the laws were obeyed though many were offended. He had written and written again, he said, that a few in London ruled over the matter. He was inhibited by statute, he affirmed, referring probably to the Henrician Act of Submission of the clergy, to set forth any constitutions without license of the prince ; and for that reason it was that he had formerly sent his Articles to be presented to the Queen ; and why they could not then be allowed he could not tell. In returning them now he “humbly prayed that if not all, yet as many as be thought good may be returned with some authority, at the least for particular apparel.” He appears to have taken legal opinion about deprivation, the grave measure which still lay before his mind, and for this he was the more anxious to have his Articles confirmed. “I must say this much more, that some lawyers be in opinion that it is hard to proceed to deprivation having no more warrant but the Queen’s Majesty’s word of mouth.” Some men, he foresaw, were so wilful that they would offer themselves to lose all, and their bodies to prison. “If I should this attempt, and have no more warrant and help, I might after much stirring do little in the end but hurt.” It is a deep question how would things have gone if he had made that reflection his guide. “If I draw forward and others draw backward what shall it avail but raise exclamations against you and me, by whom they think these matters be stirred?” But Cecil was not drawing at all, or both backward

\* He uses the word.



and forward. "I see how other men get their heads out of the collar, and convey the envy elsewhere."\* For example, Grindal.

A few days later he was fairly launched on his course. He consulted with his fellows, he conferred with his lawyers, arranged the steps of procedure, and determined to go to the length of deprivation. To call before himself and the Bishop of London all pastors and curates within the city of London, propound the cause, say something to move them to conformity, and intimate the penalty: after these general propositions, to examine every one whether they would promise conformity in ministration and outward apparel, and testify the same by subscription of their hands: to suspend all who should refuse, and pronounce sequestration of their livings from the next Lady Day: to proceed to deprivation if they were not reconciled within three months after sequestration. A more momentous decision has seldom been taken. He had weighed the cost. He calmly expected that great "speeches and talks" would arise in the whole city; that many churches would be destitute of service at Easter; and that many ministers would forsake their livings, and turn to printing, teaching, or what they could. He renewed his request for the countenance of the lay power in such an emergency. "We trust that the Queen's Majesty will send some honourable to join with us two, to authorise the rather her commandment and pleasure, as your honour signified unto me was purposed."† The day before the day of sitting he wrote again urgently upon this point, hoping for the presence of Cecil himself, Lord Keeper Bacon,

\* Parker to Cecil, March 12, 1566.—*Corresp.*, p. 262.

† To Cecil, March 20, 1566. Parker's *Corresp.* 268. Cf. Strype's *Parker*, i. p. 214.

and the Marquis of Northampton, inviting them to dinner, praying to be certified of their coming, that in default of it he might get other assistance to himself and the other bishop.\* But no laymen would touch the business. Their design from the Queen downwards was to drive the bishops to the encounter, themselves to reap the benefits. The argument that it was the work proper for the bishops to administer discipline (which was advanced in the Queen's first letter to Parker) was true to a point which was not reached by the laymen. The work was not put into the hands of the bishops merely as ordinaries, but as Commissioners: they ought to have been supported at least by their fellow Commissioners. It may be noticed however of this reign that the bishops and the clergy generally, and their Convocational assemblies in particular, had more consideration and weight than under Edward the Sixth: and this may mark a silent movement in the travel of the Reformation toward the ultimate settlement of things. But still their estimation was low enough.

On Tuesday, March 26, a memorable day, the clergy of London, with those of the Archbishop's peculiars and of Southwark, were cited to appear before the Ecclesiastical Commissioners at Lambeth. No great layman was there: none of the nobility: no member of the Council. And yet the great laymen had been ready enough to grace with their presence the disputation in Westminster held in the beginning of the reign between the Romanensians and the Evangelics. But Parker had been able to secure some assistants:

\* To Cecil, March 25.—Parker's *Corresp.* 269. It may be gathered, as Strype observes, that Cecil had promised that some persons of honour should attend.—*Ann.* i. 215. But they were "detained either by weightier matters or their own unwillingness." Neal says truly, "They refused to be concerned in such disagreeable work."—*Puritans*, i. 173.

and beside himself and his distressed brother of London were arrayed the Dean of Westminster and several canonists.\* About a hundred and ten ministers attended the summons, nine or ten being absent.† They found a pattern of conformity set before their eyes, no less than admonition for their ears. Somewhat ludicrously, one who had been of their number, a nonconforming minister who had complied, Robert Cole, Rector of St. Mary le Bow, dressed in the ecclesiastical habits prescribed, stood for exhibition near the Commissioners. Of the painful scene that followed, there is but one contemporary narrative, written by one of the ministers engaged in it, hostile to Parker, representing the proceedings to have been abrupt and overbearing. But it can scarcely be doubted that Parker carried out the order of proceeding which he had arranged, expounding the occasion with his own voice, and himself trying persuasion: and that it was not before he had done so that the Chancellor of London became the spokesman. "My masters and the ministers of London," said the Bishop's Chancellor, "the Council's pleasure is that strictly ye keep the

\* So it may be gathered from a brief account of the business written by Withers to Bullinger next year. "On the 26 of March all the London ministers were summoned before the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, the Dean of Westminster, and some canonists; and were asked whether they would acquiesce in the royal proceedings in matters of religion, ordered or to be ordered: nor was the question confined only to the habits."—*Zurich Lett.* ii. 148. I am convinced that no lay person of honour was there, but it is fair to add that according to the contemporary Stow's account there were some of the Council. He has it, "The 26 day of March in anno 1566, being Tuesday, the parsons and ministers of the churches in and about London were (by commandment) at Lambeth before the Archbishop of Canterbury and other of the Council: where charge was given them to serve their churches and wear their apparel according to the Queen's Injunctions, or else do no service."—*Memoranda*, p. 135.

† So Parker himself says; Strype says 140; Neal 100.



unity of apparel like to this man, as ye see him : that is, a square cap, a scholar's gown priestlike, or tippet, and in the church a linen surplice : and inviolably observe the rubric of the Book of Common Prayer, and the Queen's Majesty's Injunctions, and the Book of Convocation.\* Ye that will presently subscribe, write *Volo*. Those that will not subscribe, write *Nolo*. Be brief : make no words." Some of them attempting to speak, "Peace, peace," said the Chancellor. "Apparitor, call the churches. Masters, answer presently, *sub pœna contemptus* : and set your names." The apparitor, or summoner, called the names of the churches ; first the peculiars of Canterbury ; then of the incumbents of Southwark, in Winchester diocese ; then of the London clergy. They were mightily surprised at this resolute procedure.† Great was the mourning among some of them. "We are killed in our souls for this pollution of ours ; for that we cannot perform in the singleness of our hearts this our ministry." Of the whole number there were but thirty-seven however who were Nonconformists : sixty-one complied. The best of them, and some that were preachers, were, as Parker owned, among the obstinate. Some of them, it is said, gave in a paper of reasons for refusing the apparel.‡ The Archbishop and his

\* That is, the Articles of Religion.

† Strype has given this too prejudiced account, *Life of Grindal*, p. 98, partly from the Journal of Earl, Incumbent of St. Mildred, Bread Street, who was among the ministers cited.

‡ This paper was printed by Neal from a MS. in his own possession.—*Puritans*, i. 174. It is entitled, "Reasons, grounded upon the Scriptures, whereby we are persuaded not to admit the use of the outward apparel and ministering garments of the Pope's Church." It is probable that it was not given in on the day : but drawn up directly afterwards, and perhaps sent in to the Commissioners. It gives the same reasons that are found in papers already considered : as, not to offend little ones, avoid appearance of evil, things offered to idols : and cites Tertullian, Origen, Durandus,

fellow Commissioner, the Bishop of London, immediately suspended them; and signified to them that if they conformed not within three months they would be deprived *ipso facto*. He expected a rough clamour: but found, as he acknowledged, quietness and modesty in their demeanour. Some of them, who had been newly appointed, asked to be dispensed from paying the first-fruits, as they were to be sequestered from the benefice: but he told them that it lay not with him to dispense them. He calculated somewhat coldly that some of them would yield when they felt their wants: that though some were men of conscience, others were of a "spiced fancy," and had more zeal and good meaning than learning and judgment: that "the wound was yet green."\* He was not dis-

Lindwood, and other authors. The ending is grave: "We cannot but think that in using of these things we should beat back those that are coming from superstition, and confirm those that are grown in superstition, and consequently overthrow that which we have been labouring to build, and incur the danger of that horrible curse that our Saviour has pronounced, 'Woe to the world because of offences.' . . . We have thought good to yield ourselves into the hands of men, to suffer whatsoever God hath appointed us to suffer for the preferring of the commandments of God and a clear conscience before the commandments of men. . . . Not despising men, therefore, but trusting in God only, we seek to serve Him with a clear conscience so long as we shall live here, assuring ourselves that those things that we shall suffer for doing so shall be a testimony to the world, that great reward is laid up for us in heaven, where we doubt not but to rest for ever with them that have before our days suffered for the like."

\* Such was the account of the affair which he sent the same day to Cecil. It deserves to be quoted:—"I must signify to your honour what this day we have done in the examination of the London ministers. Sixty-one promised conformity; nine or ten were absent; thirty-seven denied, of which number were the best, and some preachers: six or seven convenient sober men, pretending a conscience, divers of them but zealous, and of little learning and judgment. In fine we did suspend them, and sequester their fruits, and from all manner ministry, with signification that if they would not reconcile themselves within three months, then to be deprived. They showed reasonable quietness and modesty, otherwise than I looked for. I think some of them will come

appointed entirely. As the weeks passed, without sign of the relaxation of the discipline, many submitted themselves within the time prescribed. The rest were actually deprived.

It was a day of calamity and rebuke : but not of blame to be easily assigned or apportioned. Things indifferent, the inexpediency whether of allowing or refusing things indifferent, the appearance of evil to be avoided, the offence of the weak brother, might be argued from side to side. The temporal powers had acted meanly : but they might allege with some face that they had but left discipline to the proper hands. As for Parker, he was as well convinced of the necessity of standing firm for order, as his opposites were of carrying things further. He had begun by persuasion, in the case of Sampson and Humphrey, and it was immediately upon his failure to pacify them that he was impelled to judicial action by the Queen. If it be said that if he had stopped when the Queen ceased to support him, the first great act of persecution by the Court of High Commission would not have been committed, it may be answered the Queen never supported him at all. After propelling him by an imperious and threatening letter, she went not with him to a certain point and there stopped, that he might stop also : but she went not a single step with him, so that he had to choose between wholly neglecting her

in when they shall feel their want, especially such as but in a spiced fancy hold out : some of them no doubt were moved in a conscience, which I laboured by some Advertisements to pacify, but the wound is yet green : it is not felt as I think it will hereafter. Some of them alleged they were in fruits, and would have had some toleration or discharge of payment. I answered I could not so dispense, and left them to their own suit. Thus your honour hath all worth the writing. I pray your honour move my lord of London to execute order. My lord of Ely did write me a letter, wherein he did signify that if London were reformed all the realm would soon follow : as I believe the same.”—Parker's *Corresp.* 269.



commands or proceeding alone. Such men as he and Cox of Ely, when they found themselves in the Commission for Ecclesiastical Causes, were not likely to understand that they were there as creatures, to move exactly at command, never to strike without express permission, to forbear at the bidding of every courtier with whom the Nonconformists made interest, and to watch the turns of the Queen, Lord Dudley, or the Chief Secretary. If Parker appeared stern, which is more than is known, yet a judge who weeps may half undo the salutary impression of his own severity. The Archbishop showed charity to his opposites, befriending them even in the act of discipline: insomuch that, albeit in the seat of judgment he denied himself able to dispense them from first-fruits who were in payment of them, yet afterwards, when some of them stood out and were actually deprived, for them he procured a dispensation from first-fruits.\* On the other side we can blame as little those who maintained their opinion as those who yielded: but it was a calamity, it grew to a scandal, that good men, weeping families, not many but too many in number, left happy abodes, were deprived and amoved.

The wonder is that none of them challenged their deprivation. Nor, so far as I know, has the question of legality been raised by any of the writers who have narrated, lamented, or enjoyed their fate. If they had

\* The "draft of a pardon for first-fruits of certain ministers deprived, Anno 1566," is given by Strype, *Parker*, Bk. iii. App. No. lii. It is not only for those who had been already deprived, but for those who might be for a year from the time of issue, "for not observing and obeying certain Ecclesiastical Rites and Ceremonies by our laws and Injunctions appointed, and for refusing to wear such distinct and decent apparel as by public order is commanded." Strype remarks that, as Parker had informed Secretary Cecil of the complaint of the deprived about payment of first-fruits, he probably moved him to grant this warrant for dispensing it.—*Parker*, 230.

appealed at once against Parker's proceeding herein, it is possible that they might have established that it was not in the power of the Conformists to put from their ministry men who had taken the Oath of Supremacy and were otherwise obedient: they might have shut behind themselves the door of exit which was beginning to open, and have taught the Conformists that they could not compel or exclude them, but must continue to contend with them within the enclosure of the Church by the arms of reason only. The history of England might have been different, if the Puritans had gone to the law courts. Parker, as it has been seen, was doubtful of his power to deprive them, even when he did it. He did it only by the *ipso facto* clauses of the Act for Uniformity: which appear to have been applicable to the case only by interpretation.\*

Among the Commissioners themselves there was great diversity of opinion. Bishop Cox of Ely and the learned Guest of Rochester were the only prelates who went heartily with Parker in these measures. They were not on the bench beside him on the memorable day: but Cox sent him a letter of encourage-

\* See above, in the beginning of this chapter. It must have been on the strength of the Act for Uniformity that Parker went: since, according to his own words, which Strype has followed, he prescribed "deprivation *ipso facto*." — *Correspondence*, 274; cf. Strype's *Life of Grindal*, 98. And if, as Strype also says, the matter propounded was habits and apparel, and likewise "the observation of the Book of Common Prayer, as was appointed by the statute and the rubric of the said Book" (*Ib.*), the same conclusion (that the statute was forced by interpretation) seems still to remain, as the Ornaments rubric only may be meant. In fact, it was alternately asserted and denied that the vestiarian question only was propounded. Bishop Grindal asserted positively: "those who have been deprived were removed not on account of any other points of controversy, but solely on account of the habits." To Bullinger, Feb., 1567.—*Zur. Lett.* i. 176. George Withers contradicted him, *ib.* ii. 148: but who was the likelier to know the truth?

ment. Bishop Horne of Winchester was absent, although the business affected his diocese. Neither he nor the remaining assessor, Bullingham of Lincoln, who was absent also, had any liking for the proceedings. As to Bishop Grindal, the Primate had been dissatisfied with him from the first. He had requested him to execute the laws and Injunctions, and Grindal had replied that if the Queen charged him so to do, he would obey. Whereupon he had begged Cecil to procure a private letter to be written to him by the Queen in that behalf, that it was of the greatest concern for the city of London to be brought to conformity for the example of the whole realm, and it was in London that there was the most disorder. No such letter was penned: but as Grindal went to Court within a few days, Parker was in hopes that the Queen would admonish him by word of mouth. Grindal returned from Court and informed him that she had spoken "not six words to him for the Uniformity of his London." Now, on the day of execution of discipline, Grindal's demeanour was so little pleasing to his Metropolitan, that he wrote on the same day to Cecil, "I pray your honour move my lord of London to execute order." \* All this time Parker was greatly disgusted with the Court. "Some of your preachers," he protested to Cecil in Lent, "preached before the Queen's Majesty without tippet, and had nothing said to them for it." No sooner had he performed this tragedy for garments and vesture, than Cole, the eloquent Archdeacon of Essex, was seen at the Court, not in cap and gown as appointed by the Queen's Injunctions, but "in his hat and short cloak." Where was the good of attempting to enforce the Queen's Injunctions at that rate? †

\* Parker's *Correspondence*, 234, 235, 270.† *Ib.*, 237, 264.



The Articles or Ordinances of the Archbishop still remained unpublished. He had put them to press some time before the day of discipline : but it was not till two days after, on March 28, that he sent a printed copy to Cecil. He called them now upon the title-page by the humbler name of Advertisements, though by the headings within they were still Articles, and under that unique designation they have figured in history. He sent it to the Secretary for final correction. "This form is but newly printed," said he, "and yet stayed till I may hear your advice. I am now fully bent to prosecute this order, and to delay no longer, and I have weeded out of these articles all such of doctrine et cætera, which peradventure stayed the book from the Queen's Majesty's approbation, and have put in but things avouchable, and, as I take them, against no law of the realm." Thus it appears, in the singular history of the Advertisements, as they must be called henceforth, that they were not used in the examination of the ministers at Lambeth and the first enforcement of uniformity, the purpose for which they were designed.\* Cecil returned them without further emendation, but still without the royal authorisation which the Archbishop had striven so earnestly to obtain. They were printed by Wolfe, without date : the author of them took care to proclaim on the title-page that their origin was the Queen's letter, the tremendous mandate that awoke the strife;† and an

\* This is confirmed by Stow, who, after his summary of the transactions of March 26, adds, "And that same week, or the beginning of the next, came forth a book in print, subscribed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of London, Winchester, Ely, and divers others, which appointed the said ministers to wear their gowns and cloaks with standing collars and cornered capes, and at their services wear surplices, or else not to minister."—*Memoranda*, 135.

† The title-page was, "Advertisements partly for due order in the public administration of Common Prayers and using of the Holy Sacra-

able and ingenious Preface made the same reference twice, so that it would take a diligent reader to detect the lack of actual authorisation, and at the same time sought to soften them: that "these rules were not prescribed as laws equivalent with the eternal word of God, and as of necessity to bind the consciences of the subjects in the nature of them considered in them-

ments, and partly for the apparel of all persons ecclesiastical, by virtue of the Queen's Majesty's letters commanding the same the xxv. day of January in the seventh year of the reign of our Sovereign Lady Elizabeth," &c. There has been considerable confusion about the date of the Advertisements. First of all, the *Canons* of 1604 have mistaken the date of the Queen's letter (January 7 Eliz.), which this title-page gives, for the date of the Advertisements: "according to the Advertisements published Anno 7 Eliz."—*Canon* 24. Next, almost all the reprints of the Advertisements have been misled the same way. When Bishop Sparrow reprinted them in his *Collection*, in 1661, he added to the original title-page of Wolfe, after the last word "solum," the words "Anno Dom. 1564, Anno 7 Eliz. Reg." Hearne, who next reprinted them in his edition of Camden's *Elizabeth*, gave the title-page word for word after Wolfe, without Sparrow's addition: thus he leaves the Advertisements undated, as they were originally. That great antiquary says in his Preface that he was led to reprint them because of their rarity; and seems to speak of Sparrow's publication with some disparagement: "Mihimet plusquam satis est manifestum Monitiones istas seorsim editas (nam Editionem in Collectione Sparroviana nihil moror) non sine summa difficultate apud bibliopolas comparari posse."—*Præf.*, xxxii. Nevertheless Wilkins (iv. 247), who comes next, while professing to reprint the Advertisements from Hearne, adds Sparrow's wrong date, which Hearne so cautiously avoided. Cardwell (*Annals*, i. 287) follows Wilkins in this error. More recently Mr. Prothero puts the date 1565 (*Statutes and Documents*, 191). This would be right for the Queen's letter. As the seventh year of Elizabeth ran from Nov., 1564, to Nov., 1565, it is evident that the January of that year, when the Queen's letter issued, would be that of 1565. At last, Messrs. Gee and Hardy have got it right, 1566, the eighth of Elizabeth, not the seventh (*Documents Illustrative*). Thus it is the last reprint only that has got the date right. Historians have been equally misled. Strype puts the publication of the Advertisements in 1564, on Sparrow's authority (*Parker*, 158). Collier follows Strype: "These Advertisements were printed by Wolfe in the year 1564; see Sparrow's *Collections*" (vi. 400). Soames follows Collier (*Eliz. Religious Hist.*, 42). And they who make history have been deceived, as well as they who write it, by Wolfe's title-page; or rather, by the title ingeniously constructed by Parker himself. So, for example, was Grindal (see next note).

selves.”\* Parker sent them immediately to Grindal, to the Dean of Bocking, and the incumbents of his

\* These ill-fated Advertisements have been held by modern lawyers to have been Elizabeth's “further Order” in the regulation of ceremonies and rites of the Church, which she might have taken by the Act for Uniformity, as it has been seen: but which she never took, unless it were in the imperfect instances that have been considered in her Injunctions (see Vol. V., ch. xxxii., of this work). If they had been such “further Order,” she would have authorised them instead of refusing to authorise them, and they would have been published as such. It is curious, however, how soon the rudiments of this notion began to gather: and I think that they first rose out of misunderstanding Parker's title-page and Preface. 1. Grindal, later in this year, as we shall presently see, sent round a circular letter (May 21) to the bishops, in which he spoke of “the Queen's Majesty's authority expressed in the treaty entitled the Advertisements.” 2. Grindal, ten years later, in 1576, in a visitation of Gloucester, made by deputy, bade the clergy “not to oppose the Queen's Injunctions, nor the Ordinations nor Articles made by some of the Queen's Commissioners, January 25, in the seventh year of the Queen's reign.” Whereon Strype remarks that under Grindal the Advertisements recovered their first name of Articles and Ordinances.—*Life of Parker*, 160. But it follows not that they got the Queen's authorisation, or were her “further Order” in ceremonies and rites, because Grindal called them Articles or Ordinations. Moreover it may be noticed that Grindal was gazing at Parker's title-page, and confused the Advertisements with the Queen's letter of January 25 in the seventh year of her reign. 3. Hallam repeated this from Strype, to whom he refers: “Some years after, these Advertisements obtained the Queen's sanction, and got the name of Articles and Ordinances.”—*Const. Hist.* i. 180. Perhaps it is from Hallam that the judges and lawyers of this age have drawn this notion about them. All the authority that they had from the Queen was that they were composed by the Metropolitan in consequence of her letter to him—which letter was no commission. But they were worked by the Ecclesiastical Commission as an engine all the same as if she had sanctioned them. They have no interest now beyond historical interest. However, in the present age they have formed the base of the judgments of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in more than one celebrated ritual case, on the assumption that they were Elizabeth's “further Order,” and a number of pamphlets and dissertations have been written in attack and defence of that position. Some curious arguments have been advanced. Take for instance the Ridsdale Judgment, 1878; the Bench said, “Their Lordships are clearly of opinion that the Advertisements (a word which in the language of the time was equivalent to ‘admonitions or injunctions’) of Elizabeth, issued in 1566, were ‘a taking of order’ within the Act of Parliament by the Queen with the advice of the Metropolitan.” And as it had been urged in court that the corre-



own peculiar, with strong admonitions for enforcing them. At the same time he expressed to Cecil his opinion of "these silly recusants." They had reckoned

spondence of Parker himself was dead against this prevalent view, they magnificently added, "Their Lordships cannot lend any countenance to the suggestion that the legitimate inference to be drawn from the tenor and language of public documents, from the acts done under them, and from the public recognition of their authority, could in any case be controlled by expressions found in a correspondence of this character."—*Folkestone Ritual Case*, p. 707. In the various writings that have been put forth on that side of the question, so far as I have seen, there is nothing very solid. "The legal force of the Advertisements was not publicly questioned for a hundred and forty years."—Swainson's *Hist. Enquiry*, 1880. No doubt, as the Queen would not sanction the Advertisements, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners went on without her, and absorbed public odium, as it was meant they should. "Public authority" is the phrase used by Archbishop Parker subsequently, in some of his Visitation Articles, &c., and others to describe the authority which the Advertisements possessed; and so it is argued that they must have had the Queen's sanction. "For 'public authority' is a phrase constantly used for the highest authority common to the whole community."—Tomlinson's *Prayer Book, Articles and Homilies*, p. 79. Nay rather that the phrase should have been used is a proof the other way; if Parker could have said royal authority, he would not have said public authority. But now, whence this anxious desire to uplift the authority of the Advertisements? It is because they have been held to have annulled the Ornaments rubric of Elizabeth's Prayer Book by taking "further order" as to the dress of ministers in church. Elizabeth's rubric (restoring the rubric of the First Book of Edward) was to the effect that the celebrant should have on him "a white alb plain with a vestment or cope," and the assistants "albs with tunicles." The Advertisements, on the other hand, ordered the celebrant, Epistoler, and Gospeller all to wear copes in cathedral and collegiate churches, and in parish churches all ministers at all times to wear "a comely surplice with sleeves." Hereupon Mr. Tomlinson, the latest and most curious expert who has travelled over the ground, remarks that "the Advertisement pointedly and flatly contradicts the rubric": that the rubric "ordered the cope to be worn at the ante-Communion precisely where the Advertisements forbade its being so worn": and that, although by the rubric the celebrant had a distinctive dress, by the Advertisements the celebrant, Epistoler, and Gospeller were all to be dressed alike: that it was no case of minimum and maximum, but "of direct conflict and express contradiction" (p. 87). It seems not to have struck him that all that about copes was only for cathedral and collegiate churches, not for parish churches; so that it was not a general order. He explains "all other prayers to be said at that

that in the scarcity of ministers the matter would never have been pressed to a point : but now some of them were beginning to repent, and one had been already asking to be admitted again to his ministry and promising conformity : he wished the most part of them out of the ministry, "as mere ignorant and vain heads." \*

Of those who were absent on the memorable day from Lambeth and discipline, history may record with joy the name of Miles Coverdale, now vicar of St. Magnus, London Bridge, whose letter of excusation is extant. It would have been a dire spectacle if the Archbishop had been under the yoke of dealing severely

Communion table" to mean "the ante-Communion": it is expounded in the Canons of 1604 to mean "the time of divine service and prayers in all cathedral or collegiate churches where there is no Communion" (§ 25). He fails to notice that it is only the order next following, about the comely surplice with sleeves, which refers to parish churches, and that this was simply a minimum, and therefore not contradictory of the rubric which ordered albs and copes, albs and tunicles. It was as much as to say, *You nonconforming parochs, if you would put on albs and copes, albs and tunicles, it would be better; but at least you must put on a surplice.* He claims for these particular Advertisements about dresses the authority of the Canons of 1604 : and certainly they have it, understood in the way I have indicated, and not as contradicting the rubric. Thus, in Canon 24, "Copes to be worn in Cathedral Churches," it is ordered that "in all cathedrals and collegiate churches the principal minister shall wear a decent cope, being assisted by the Gospeller and Epistoler agreeably, according to the Advertisements published Anno 7 Eliz." In Canon 58 it is ordered that "Every minister saying the public prayers or ministering the Sacrament or other rites of the Church shall wear a decent and comely surplice with sleeves," &c.; repeating the words of the Advertisement that was for parish churches. There was no contradiction between these ordinances and the rubric, in the opinion of the framers of the Canons, for they ordered also that "All ministers should observe the orders, rites, and ceremonies prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer: *Singuli etiam ministri studiose observabunt instituta, ritus, et ceremonias omnes quæ in prædicto Libro præscribuntur tam in Sacris Scripturis legendis, ac præcibus recitandis, quam in administrandis Sacramentis.*"—Canon 14.

\* Parker to Grindal, March 28, 1566; Wilkins, iv. 251; Parker's *Corresp.*, 271, 272.

with the Bishop whose hands had been laid upon his head in consecration.\* But the venerable and indeed illustrious prelate, though not compelled, enjoyed not long his modest portion, resigning in the course of the year.† Of those who were sequestered or suspended were Turner, Dean of Wells, who lost a lectureship in Middlesex; Allen and Wyburn, who were deprived and betook themselves to husbandry; Whitehead and Brakelsby; Crowley of St. Giles, Cripplegate. Of those who refused at first, but afterwards conformed and subscribed to Parker's test, were the well-known Becon and Whittingham, and one William Clark: all of whom afterwards received preferment. To these may be added Earl of St. Mildred, Bread Street, the diarist who had related the scene in Lambeth Chapel:‡ and Beddall of St. Pancras,§ and Barthlett.||

The fame of this beginning of a great strife ran far and wide. As soon as it became known that compulsion was meditated, Bishop Pilkington of Durham wrote a long protestation to Leicester. "Such grief to be taken at a cap among men of civility and knowledge, while in the rude superstitious people on the border here, priests go about with sword, dagger, and coarse

\* "Whereas I am summoned to appear with others to-morrow afore my lord's grace at Lambeth, I beseech your worthiness to be means for me unto his grace that at this present I may be dispensed with: not only for that I am unwieldy, and could neither well travel by land nor altogether safely by boat, but also for other considerations which this bearer my dear friend, shall signify by mouth." To Parker's chaplain, March 25, 1566.—Coverdale's *Remains*, 532.

† The old bishop's church of St. Magnus seems to have been a stronghold of Nonconformity. "There was a Scot who preached in it twice a day, and ministered every day to all comers of the parish or any other in his gown or cloke."—Stow's *Memoranda*, 138. Perhaps this man was Wood, of whom Grindal wrote to Parker, "Wood the Scottishman is a factious fellow."—Strype's *Grindal*, 104.

‡ Ibid. 97.

|| *Dom. Cal.* 271.

§ Parker's *Corresp.* 278.



apparel, not scrupulous of colour or fashion, and none is offended at them! Are worthy men to be cast out of the ministry for such small matters, in such a scarcity of teachers in the realm? It is necessary in apparel to show how a Protestant is to be known from a Papist. Popery is beggarly; patched up of all sorts of ceremonies. The white rochets of bishops began with a Novatian heretic: and these other things, the cap and the rest, have the like foundation."\* The Dean of Durham, Whittingham, wrote even more strongly to the same patron of Nonconformity. "Fear and despair discourage me. The letters of many, the report of all, advertise me of a decree either passed or at hand to compel us against our conscience to wear the old popish apparel or be deposed from our ministry. No third choice. But what Christian, considering the strait account we have to make to the Almighty for the right use and dispensation of His mysteries, can doubt of the better of these two? The only thing that makes a show for maintaining the apparel is the opinion of indifferency. But in religion a thing indifferent becomes hurtful if it lack the circumstances of edification. What edification is there, where the Spirit of God is grieved, the weak brother brought in doubt of religion, the wicked Papist confirmed in error? They say that it is not to set forth popery, but for the sake of the conservation of polity. A very poor

\* Pilkington to Leicester, Oct. 25, 1564.—Strype's *Parker*, Bk. ii. App. No. xxv. This Epistle was afterwards altered into an Epistle general of consolation, and printed; perhaps by the author, perhaps after his death. See the note in *Works*, Park. Soc., 658. As it was to encourage scruplers of the habits, I have brought it in here: but it was not written on the occasion. It contains the argument on which Parker himself said that the Nonconforming clergy relied beforehand for impunity: that "the realm has such scarcity of teachers, that if so many worthy men should be cast out of the ministry for such small matters, many places would be destitute."

polity. When I think of Jeroboam and his calves, I tremble to see the popish garments set forth under the vizard and countenance of polity. If polity may cloak popery and superstition, then may crowns and crosses, oil and cream, images and candles, palms and beads claim place again by virtue of this polity. Why should compulsion be used to us and lenity to the Papists? How many Papists enjoy liberty and livings, who have neither sworn obedience to the Queen, nor yet do any part of duty towards their miserable flocks! They triumph over us; they brag that they trust that the rest of their things will follow.”\* From Sherburn, near Durham, the great preacher Lever wrote to Leicester and Cecil a letter which touched as faithfully the evils of the age as his sermons had formerly in Edward’s chapel. “England, polluted with covetous spoil, especially of impropriations, grammar schools, and other provision for the poor, cannot use power and policy to prevail against the enemies of God and godly religion, if it still sink into such corruption. The necessary revenues of the Prince, the Bishops, the Universities, other Estates, rather sink into the corruption than stand on the profits of impropriations. There is sinking, not standing, in the Universities and elsewhere, when the lawfully admitted minister and diligent preacher is deposed from office and living for refusing the prescription of man in apparel; and the name, office, and living of minister allowed to another who cannot and will not preach, except it be sometimes through a substitute, but observes to wear the apparel and read. Pray allow not such corruption among Protestants as may make Papists hope for a day: abolish inward and outward Papistry; so to cause

\* Whittingham to Leicester.—Strype’s *Parker*, 156 and App. No. xxvii.

idolatrous traitors to grieve. Cast out the unsavoury ministry. If in the ministry the sharpness of salt, by doctrine to mortify affections, be rejected, then doth Christ threaten such treading under foot as no power or policy can withstand or abide.”\* From Oxford the learned nephew of Pilkington, Kingsmill, the friend of Sampson and Humphrey, said to have been the only preacher there besides them, addressed to Parker himself a long letter against urging the habits.†

The Archbishop was soon in the midst of the struggle which had been forced on him, and not refused by him. Within a week after the tragical commencement at Lambeth, one of the suspended ministers, Crowley, Vicar of St. Giles, Cripplegate, backed by an alderman’s deputy, at a funeral, standing at the church door, forbade the entrance of six clerks wearing surplices, who marched in front of the corpse: that “the church was his, given him for life by the Queen who made him vicar: that he would rule the place, and not suffer any such superstitious rags of Rome to enter.” The clerks pleaded as vainly as truly that they were but obeying the recent order of the bishop of the diocese.‡ The party of the vicar was the stronger: and after considerable disorder the clerks were fain to tarry outside. The Lord Mayor reported the disturbance to the Metropolitan, who forthwith sent for Grindal, and sat with him upon the case the next day. In examination, Crowley showed a leaning to Anabaptist opinions, so the Archbishop thought: that he had a motion to preach in his church, not being deprived, “without extern vocation”: that he would resist the

\* Lever to Leicester and Cecil, Sherburn Hospital, Feb. 24, 1565.—Strype’s *Parker*, 212 and App. No. xlvii.

† Ibid. 157.

‡ Referring, it is probable, to Grindal’s Visitation of the year before. See last chapter.



wolf, if he could. Asked whether he would resist a Conformist minister, if one were sent to his church, he said that he would, so long as he was not "discharged" of his ministry, but desired to be discharged. Parker took him at his word and instantly discharged him of his flock and parish. Thereupon he, reasonably enough, required to be deprived by law. Parker told him that he wanted both to be deprived and not deprived. He said that he would glory in going to prison rather than suffer such a wolf as a Conformist to come to his flock. Parker "dulled his glory" by not sending him to prison, but charging him to keep his house: and bound the deputy, who had abetted him, in a hundred pounds to appear before the Council if either of them were called. He dismissed them with an admonition of obedience and a copy of the Advertisements. Next Sunday his chaplain preached in St. Giles, and was heard quietly: and, while the vicar was keeping his house, a Conforming minister with a surplice was sent to the parish and received there.\*

On Palm Sunday, April 7, the Conforming minister of All Hallows in Thames Street had a zealous Scot, who was the ornament of Coverdale's church of St. Magnus,† to preach in his church: who delivered a violent invective "against the order taken by the Queen and council for the apparel of ministers, with very bitter and vehement words against the Queen, and also against such ministers as received the same." The minister, sitting in his surplice, smiled. At the end of the sermon a dyer and a fishmonger, angry at the smile, "reasoned with the minister," and "fell at last from rough words to blows with them that took

\* Parker to Cecil, April 3 and 4.—*Corresp.* 275-7; Strype's *Parker*, 218; Stow's *Memoranda*, 135.

† Above, p. 106.

his part." That Scot conformed three months later in St. Margaret Pattins in Rood Lane; where he appeared in a surplice, was stoned, pulled out of the pulpit, his surplice rent, and his face scratched, by some women.

The whole week before Easter the Archbishop sat in commission, with Doctor Drury and two other assessors, upon such "brabbling matters," as he called them: till his health failed, and he was compelled to take to his bed. He sent his chaplains about, three or four of them, to serve in the greatest parishes: but for lack of surplices and of the wafer bread ordered in the Queen's Injunctions they could mostly only preach. Many churchwardens would not provide either surplices or wafer bread. On Palm Sunday, in St. Mary Magdalene in Milk Street, one of his chaplains who was serving being informed that some communicants desired to receive, the table was made ready: but whilst the minister was reading the Gospel, a man of the parish drew from the table both the cup and the wafer bread: the minister was derided, and the people disappointed: "which fact was after made but a laughing game." On the same day it was said that 600 persons came to a church, ready to have received; and found the doors shut. Cecil expressed alarm about this report. "It is," said the Archbishop, "such an elephant as may be made out of a fly. These precise men, for all their brag of 600 communicants, profess openly that they will neither communicate nor come to church where there is either cap or surplice." On Easter Day the disquiet ran higher. The people came in great number to the Communion, but in many churches the quarrelling between ministers and parishioners was so great, that there was nothing to be done but to close the doors

and cause the people to depart without receiving. On Low Sunday the deputy alderman of the ward of the parish of St. Mildred in Bread Street, with other worshipful persons, brought a minister with a surplice to serve in the afternoon : who was withstood by the parson and his adherents, so that the chief men of the parish were fain to stand by him on either side to defend him to the end of the service. In some parishes the ministers and preachers who were prohibited or suspended, went on ministering and preaching as before ; and used the pulpit to inveigh against the orders set forth, against the Queen, the Council, and the bishops.\* Parker kept on his way undaunted. He put some who had fallen to open blows in the churches into his prison. He had before him some preachers new come to London and “moving to sedition,” and charged them to silence. His own peculiars, fourteen or fifteen in number, he brought to conformity, though not without difficulty, and had them “all in order.” He calmly remarked that if some parishes in London were left without ministers, it was “no great inconvenience ; they might go elsewhere ; London was no grange,” or wide country district. He had indeed reckoned upon this before he began to enforce conformity, as he now reminded Cecil.† As for the Bishop of London, he protested

\* These examples and occurrences are taken from Parker’s *Correspondence*, Stow’s *Memoranda*, and Strype.

† “Your honour knoweth that my lord of London and I in our letters jointly signified that there would be many parishes unserved, and many speeches would arise, and much resistance would there be.” April 12.—*Corresp.* 278. He refers to the joint letter of himself and Grindal, as Commissioners, of March 20, sketching the proceedings that they thought of taking with the London clergy : in which they said, “We think very many churches will be destitute for service this Easter, and that many will forsake their livings, and live at printing, teaching children, or otherwise, as they can” (p. 268).



that he had very little assistance from him, but was compelled to do his work. He had "to see and judge all the preachers in London": to call before him many churchwardens who were of London's jurisdiction, and peruse their doings. He asked Cecil to speak to the Bishop of London to see to his own charge. He saw others drawing back and winning honour, whilst he bore the burden, and was vilely reported. "I am not weary to bear," said he, "to do service to God and my prince; but an ox can draw no more than he can." At this moment he received from Cecil the Queen's pleasure that the Archbishop of York should push the Orders for uniformity in the northern Province: he foresaw his brother primate involved in the same difficulties with himself: and he sharply replied that he trusted that the Queen had devised how her will might be performed. He bitterly reproached the Queen and the Council for their meanness, comparing how differently Cranmer had been backed, when Hooper started Nonconformity in his time. He urged either that Nonconformity should be tolerated, or that he should be supported against it. "I am always waiting her toleration, or else further aid. Can it be thought that I alone, having sun and moon against me, can compass their difficulty? If you of the Council provide no otherwise for this matter, I tremble to think what the sequel will be. In King Edward's days the whole body of the Council travailed in Hooper's attempt. My predecessor, Doctor Cranmer, labouring in vain with Bishop Farrar, the Council took it in hand. What I see and hear, what complaints are brought unto me, how I am used of many men's hands, I shall not report. If I die in the cause, I shall commit my soul to God in a good conscience." \*

\* Parker to Cecil, 12 and 28 April.—*Corresp.* 278–80.

The ardour of the Nonconformists soon flew to their pens: and a literary warfare, which was destined to produce some memorable monuments, had now a humble beginning. Vigorous libels were written and strewed about the streets. Vigorous books, or tracts, were set forth in print, and distributed in their congregations.\* One of these, entitled *The Voice of God*, was the composition of one Towers, a musical coalman who supplied the Tower of London, the fury of whose soul was not the less that he had been long in the service of St. Paul's, and daily wore a surplice there for ten pounds a year. Another, a more important work, was compiled by the remarkable Crowley from the suggestions of the whole number of the abnegant ministers. It was the first manifest of Nonconformity. Crowley, who was not only vicar of the church which he had defended against an army in white, but Archdeacon of Hereford, Prebendary of St. Paul's, Rector of St. Peter le Poer, and one of the readers of St. Antholin's, had been a bookseller. To him the rest of them resorted with their advice in writing: in the digestion of which the two other readers of St. Antholin assisted him: for St. Antholin held three readers, and the triumvirate was completed by Philpot, sometime a scrivener but now Rector of St. Michael's, Cornhill, parson of Stepney and other spiritual possessions, and by Gough, Rector of St. Peter's, Cornhill, sometime a scrivener. These three readers made St. Antholin's the head quarters of Nonconformity in London: "they were the most earnest withstanders of the laws concerning the order of ministration, the greatest animators of the whole city, upon whom the greatest number of other ministers did depend."†

\* "Two sorts of seditious books were set forth in print, and given at their morning congregations."—Stow's *Memoranda*, 139.

† *Ibid.*

The book which they perfected bore three designations: entitled "A brief Discourse against the outward apparel and ministering garments of the Popish Church"; headed "A Declaration of the doings of those ministers of God's word and Sacraments in the city of London, which have refused to wear the outward apparel and ministering garments of the Pope's Church"; paginally superscribed "The Unfolding of the Pope's Attire."\*

\* This little tract, memorable as the first distinct utterance of Nonconformity, has for its title-page, "A Brief Discourse against the outward apparel and ministering garments of the Popish Church. Ps. 31. I have hated all those that hold of superstitious vanities. 1566." Then comes a copy of verses, "The Book to the Reader," thus—

The Pope's attire, whereof I talk, I know to be but vain; Wherefore some men that witty are To read me will disdain.	King David could not take it well, But thought himself despised When Hanun sent his servants back Dishonoured and disguised.
---	---

But I would wish that such men should With judgment read me twice: And mark how great an evil it is God's preachers to disguise.	And shall not God, think you, revenge Himself upon that rout That to deface or else displace His Preachers go about?
--	---

I know a coxcomb cannot take From wise men any wit: So do I know that such attire Is for no wise man fit.	Yes, doubtless, for the mighty God Will not long time endure The spite of such as so do seek To work Him displeasure.
--	--

Good minds cannot but much mis- like To see good men displaced: But better minds would sorrow more To see such men defaced.	All wise men therefore will beware How they do such men wrong As have such One to take their part As is for all too strong.
---	--

Their persons if ye do respect The matter is but small; But on their office if ye look Then are they guides of all.	God grant that all men may once see On which side truth doth stand, And pray to Him for such as be Made rulers of the land.
--	--

The Preacher is a messenger Sent from no worldly wight: But from that Prince that peerless is, And made all by His might.	That they, having before their eyes The fear of God above, May seek to set God's word in place And all vain toys remove.
--	---

As I have said, the tract has three titles. It ends with "A Godly Prayer,"



This manifest was widely read. It was a grave and warm vindication of the conscientious scruples of the composers, enforcing the usual arguments against the apparel and ornaments, but adding nothing new, save that it indicated the deep horror of popery that swayed the generation, and the influence of the newly published masterpiece of Fox, by adducing the doubtful example of the martyr Ridley refusing a surplice at his degradation, having contended through life zealously for the habits.\* It drew the instant attention of Parker; who put forth an answer to it revised or even written by himself:† and the Archbishop, having dealt already not very cruelly with Crowley, proceeded to call his colleagues of St. Antholin's, Philpot and Gough, to question. He sentenced them to the hospitality of Bishop Horne of Winchester, no difficult man to Nonconformists, to be convinced by him, if

in which are these words: "Are not the relics of Romish idolatry stoutly retained? Are we not bereaved of some of our pastors who by word and example sought to free Thy flock from these offences? Ah, good Lord, these are now by power put down from pastoral care: they are forbid to feed us: their voice we cannot hear. This is our great discomfort: this is the joy and triumph of Antichrist: and, which is more heavy, the increase of this misery is of some threatened, of the wicked hoped for, and of us feared, as Thy judgments against us for our sins." There is a copy in the British Museum.

\* Strype, *Annals*, i. 484, has given a full display of this book; Neal a somewhat less full one.—*Puritans*, i. 183.

† "A Brief Examination for the time of a certain Declaration lately put in print in the name and defence of certain Ministers in London refusing to wear the Apparel prescribed by the laws and orders of the realm." This was printed by the Queen's printer, Jugge, without date, without name. It affirmed that the ministers were few in themselves, other than such as had been unlearnedly brought up, most in profane occupations, or were arrogantly puffed up. A reply was immediately put forth with the title, "An answer for the time to the Examination put in print without the Author's name, pretending to maintain the apparel prescribed against the Declaration of the Ministers of London," 1566. This "Answer for the time" took the Brief Examination sentence by sentence. Look at Soames' *Elizabethan Religious Hist.*, p. 64, and Strype's *Annals*, 517.

they convinced not him, for the space of three weeks ;\* and the pair took their way to that martyrdom in a sort of triumph. Two or three hundred women, laden with bags and bottles to banquet them at their departure, giving them gold, silver, sugar, spices, and other comforts, accompanied them over London Bridge, through Southwark, and on the road towards Winchester, "animating them most earnestly to stand fast in the same their doctrine, which they had taught, touching surplices, caps, and such like." But one of them, Philpot, to the disgust of his party, and of honesty, returned to London at Michaelmas, subscribed to cap and surplice, sold his moveables, retained his livings of Cornhill and Stepney as a Conformist, went to another living in Kent, and ministered there without a surplice.†

Parker at the same time sent others of their leaders to other bishops, to Norwich and Ely; and in imposing this burden on his brethren he had the assistance of the Council.‡ Their writings had reached foreign

\* Stow's *Memoranda*, 140, June 4. Hooker, in the Preface of his great work, has remarked on the fervour displayed by women in the Nonconformist commotions.

† Stow, *ib.*

‡ The ministers who were sent to Horne, Cox, and Parkhurst were five in number. They were in trouble for having preached in their respective churches after being prohibited or suspended. They were brought before the Council, when "much was said to them" for showing disobedience to the Queen's orders to the ill example of the common people. They fell on their knees, and asked for mercy. The lords answered that "if the Queen were not merciful, they would have had severe punishment, but seeing that they were preachers of God's holy Word, they should have eight days allowed them to visit their friends," and after that they were sent to the bishops above-named. Abel to Bullinger, June 6, 1566.—*Zurich Lett.* ii. 119. Hence Parker says, "With the assistance of her Majesty's Council we have dispersed a few of the heads of them, some to the Bishop of Winchester, some to Ely, and some to Norwich, to school them, or else at the least to have them out of London, till we see cause to restore them their liberty." Parker to Haddon.—*Corresp.* 285.

parts, so industriously were they spread : and Haddon sent him from Bruges a Latin epistle concerning them : \* receiving in return a copy of the answer which the Archbishop had caused to be put forth to their Declaration, under the title of *A Brief Examination*. † This he accompanied with an expression of contempt for the "light heads who were not ashamed to put their fancies in public print," and the usual lamentation that they should be "much comforted of such whose authority should be bent to repress them." And the Archbishop took the occasion of Haddon's epistle, sending it to Cecil, to renew his reproaches against the Court and the Bishop of London. ‡

The Bishop of London was not altogether so inactive as Parker held him to be : but seems to have taken a somewhat independent course out of sympathy with the Nonconformists, or tenderness, or preferring to work through his ordinary jurisdiction, rather than by virtue of his post on the Commission. So early as the beginning of the year 1564, a year before the Queen's memorable letter, Archdeacon Mullins held a visitation, under the Bishop's Commission, in St. Sepulchre's : when he gently charged

\* Haddon to Parker, May 27, 1566.—*Corresp.* 282.

† "A Brief Examination for the time of a certain Declaration lately put in print in the name and defence of certain ministers of London refusing to wear the apparel prescribed by the laws and orders of the realm." This is fully displayed by Strype, *Annals*, i. 517. Neal remarks that whoever was the author, he was "a man of a bad spirit and abusive language."—*Puritans*, i. 185.

‡ "I send your honour letters sent me from Mr. Haddon, by the which ye may see how they ply their matters . . . and surely if there be not some more severity extended, and some personages of reputation expressing a more discontentation toward such disorderly doings, it will breed a cease one day in governance. And now my lord of London by experience seeth and feeleth the marks and bounds of these good sprites, which but for his tolerations, etc., had been suppressed for five or six years ago." To Cecil, June 5, 1566.—*Corresp.* 283.



the clergy to conform in wearing the prescribed habits according to the Queen's pleasure, praying them to put on the gown, the cap, the tippet round their necks, and in the service of the Church to use the surplice only: and to subscribe to a promise of obedience. Out of one hundred and nine, eight only refused: of them that complied many were Romanensians, or at least such as had said Mass in Queen Mary's days.\* Two years later, in this year, when the unhappy contest was really begun, the Bishop of London tried the force of opinion and argument; nor altogether without effect. He caused to be printed in English and Latin the judgment of Bullinger concerning the lawfulness of wearing the habits, a judgment (to be considered anon) of weight with Nonconformists, drawn up at the instance of three English bishops: which so wrought with many who were resolved to leave their ministry rather than execute it in a surplice, that they took new resolutions; while the excited people, whom none of their own bishops could have persuaded, upon the word of a learned foreigner, began to think that the surplice might be not a thing of naught. He put forth two syllogisms to the effect that to refuse the priestly apparel which faithful ministers, fathers,

\* It is rather difficult to see how the vestiary question could have come up so soon: Strype has taken his account from the Journal of Earl, incumbent of St. Mildred's, Bread Street, who was present. "In the month of January, the plague slacking, Archd. Mullins, by the Bishop's commission, visited at St. Sepulchre's."—*Life of Grindal*, p. 97. The note about the plague fixes the date to 1564, where Strype rightly has it. The cause is said to have been "a special order from the Privy Council, charging the Archbishops and Bishops to that intent, to quiet those stirrings and contentions that then were among the parochial ministers." The Acts of the Privy Council are unfortunately blank at that date: see Dasent. I have found no such order elsewhere. The exhortation to wear "the surplice only" seems to refer to this early date: nothing of copes, as in the Advertisements. Strype goes on to say that the scene at Lambeth was in the following March, i. e. two years before the real date.

bishops, some of them martyrs, had worn, was to condemn them; that the priestly apparel was a thing indifferent, in which the prince may command, and ought to be obeyed. But herein he was less successful: his arguments provoked denial.\* The Bishop seems to have taken his own measures with one Barthlett, a suspended Divinity lecturer in Crowley's church of St. Giles in Cripplegate, who had gone on lecturing all the same. Sixty women came to the Bishop to intercede for Barthlett; and would not depart, but at the request of Philpot, the suspended reader of St. Antholin's.† A month after that, he informed Cecil of another "womanish brabble" in a church in London.‡ About the same time he wrote to the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, enclosing them the Advertisements, and bidding them call before them all ecclesiastical persons within their deanery and office, and require them to prepare to wear the apparel and habits on pain of deprivation, and to set their names in subscription to the Advertisements, sending to him the names of those who refused.§ At the beginning of the year, the Bishop had been entrusted with the special office of seizing seditious and slanderous books, printed and sent over from abroad, which

\* Strype's *Grindal*, 106.

† "Notwithstanding he was suspended with the rest, he took upon him to read again without license." *Grindal* to Cecil, May 4, 1566.—*Domest. State Pap. Eliz.* vol. xxxix. 66; *Cal.* 271.

‡ *Dom. Cal.* 273, June 4.

§ *Domest. State Pap. Eliz.* xxxix. 76, May 21. This letter was printed in the Ridsdale Judgment, and has again been printed in Mr. Tomlinson's book, p. 64, who says it was the same that Grindal sent round to the bishops of the province. If so, he took his time with them. It was nearly two months since Parker in a very pressing letter, on the very day of the scene at Lambeth, requested him to transmit the Advertisements to their brethren of the province with letters "to cause the same to be performed in their several jurisdictions."—Parker's *Corresp.* 273, March 28.

arrived the most at the port of London.\* This appointment was, it is likely, against the books of the Romanensian exiles: books which nevertheless found their way, and were read at Court. Now, on the other hand, that the books of the Nonconformists were beginning to fly abroad, a stricter oversight of the press was deemed necessary. On the motion of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, the Council issued a decree, that no book should be imprinted, or imported into the realm, that was written against any of the statutes or laws, or against any Injunctions, letters patent, or ordinances set forth by the Queen's authority, grant, or commission, under heavy penalties: all such books that should be seized were to be brought into Stationers' Hall; the wardens of the Hall were invested with extraordinary powers of search: all offenders to be brought before the Commissioners: and all printers and booksellers were to enter into recognisances before the Commissioners, or other appointed persons, that they would obey the decree. The names of eight foremost of the Council, including Cecil, Bacon, Leicester, were appended to this decree, which was dated from the Star Chamber; and six of the Commissioners added in a note that they thought "these Ordinances meet and necessary

\* Queen Elizabeth's Letter to the Bishop of London for seizing seditious books imported from beyond sea, Jan. 24, 1565.—*Wilkins*, iv. 250. This is the document described in the *Domestic Calendar* (268) as the Queen's Letter to Winchester, the Lord Treasurer, "that all books imported, of a seditious nature, be subjected to the view of the Bishop of London." An instance of Grindal's exercise of this office was related at this time to Philip of Spain by his ambassador. A print struck in Antwerp, representing the clergy defending the proclamations of the Inquisition and the Beggars of the sea bearing them down, with some words spoken by Echo, was being sold in London. "The Bishop, as they call him, of London sent persons to the houses of the booksellers to seize the copies, and prohibited the sale; but many had been already distributed."—*Span. Cal.* 571, Aug., 1566.



to be decreed and observed.”\* The restraint of printing was according to the age. It has been slowly discovered by the advance of subsequent ages to be illiberal, and by their experience to be futile: but if it had not been found futile, it would never have been deemed illiberal: and the former of these conclusions had not then been reached. In the case of religion it was an unhappy expedient. It was inconsistent to undertake both to answer an adversary and to stifle his voice. It should have been understood that the only weapon against error is the sword of reason. The blunder was terrible. The Nonconformists could thenceforth complain not without justice of unfairness, and exclaim against tyranny with the tones of them that suffer; whilst at the same time nothing could have happened better to further their cause. Their publications acquired the sweetness of forbidden things. The style and manner of them was altered to fierceness. To try to suppress them was to let them go, to lose hold of them. It was

\* Strype has given this decree in full from the Foxii MSS., *Life of Parker*, p. 221. Neal has given a fair summary, *Puritans*, i. 186. It was in six Items, briefly thus: 1. No one to print or publish anything against the statutes or laws, the Queen's Injunctions, letters patent, or ordinances. 2. On pain of losing their stock of such books, three months' imprisonment, and never print again. 3. No person to sell, bind, or stitch such books on pain of twenty shillings. 4. Forfeited books to be brought to Stationers' Hall; half the forfeit to go to the Queen, half to the informer, and the books to be destroyed. 5. The wardens of Stationers' Hall might search suspected places, open sacks, enter warehouses, seize books, and bring offenders before the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. 6. All stationers and booksellers to be bound in money recognisances before the Commissioners or other appointed persons, to observe the premises or pay the forfeitures. This was dated "At the Star Chamber, 29 June, 1566, the 8 year of the Queen": signed by eight of the Council, and underwritten by the Archb., the Bp. of London, Amb. Cave, Dav. Lewis, Thos. Yale, Robt. Weston, Commissioners, and by T. Huicke the Notary. Cave signed both as one of the Council and one of the Commission.

precisely in this unfortunate matter that the lay power, which had stood aloof so long, stepped to the side of the Ecclesiastical Commission. The first vindication of themselves which the London ministers published, their *Brief Discourse* or *Declaration* against the apparel, and, it is probable, their reply to Parker's antidote, were suppressed under heavy penalties.\*

No general principles are observable in the writings of either side in the beginnings of this great dispute. It was but the vestiary controversy to all appearance: and the spirit that lay within was veiled, not revealed, by the narrow eyelet through which it looked. But there were wider issues involved than the ceremonies of the Church; wider even, it may be said, or more extensive, than the form of Church government: although this was only known by a filmy instinct in the folded consciousness of the age. It was touched for a moment by the Nonconformists when they exclaimed that the doings of their opponents were a policy. Their own doings were a policy also, though they knew it not. They dimly designed a policy opposite to the other; and this they carried out eventually. Sides were being taken for the mighty conflict which was to turn England into a camp, in another generation, under another dynasty. At that time the nation, like the Church, was one. There

\* "Although by order of the Queen and after much exhortation, measures have been taken to make clergymen wear their ancient garb, not only have many refused to obey but have written against it, and even against the Queen, who, they say, had no right to make such an order. The book has been prohibited under great penalties. The Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishops of London and Winchester having been consulted, the Queen believed, or was informed, that the Bishop of London would not execute the order very zealously, and she rated him soundly, and threatened to have him punished for an anabaptist, with other expressions of the same sort."—*Span. Cal.*, May, 1566, p. 553.

were no political parties in the nation. All centred in the sovereign; the throne was all. Loyalty and treason were the only public passions: there were no other catchwords. There were factions, the rivalries of the Court, but not parties. But political parties were as necessary to the vast new life that was beginning to swell in the nation as veins and lungs are to the body. The new life of liberty, the modern life, was presently to form its own organisms; and, being complex, to manifest its complexity by the multiplication of them. It was of the highest convenience for stability that the first stirrings should have been in the Church, not the nation, or in the nation considered as the Church; not in the State civil, but ecclesiastical. So had it been from the first of Christianity. Paganism left kings to rule and nations to obey: it had no power on human life. Christianity, the call of Heaven, gave the first motives that arranged mankind upon principles of thought. The theological parties of the Empire breathed the first promise of civil freedom. But they never passed into civil combination, to be parties in a whole republic, to divide the whole into parts and yet keep it whole. The Empire, as a state, never ceased to be Pagan, to be the rule of one, however it rocked in the ærial currents of theological thought. Now at length the time was drawing nigh, when, in other ages and races, religious parties might be transfused into political parties, and approach the consummation of liberty. Political parties are modern.

The Queen had an intuitive suspicion of something latent in the extraordinary agitation of the vestiarly question, of a mere ministerial difference, a dispute among ministers. She knew of the general indifference of the people throughout the country as to



the prevalence of one or another form of religion : for that character of the age remained unaltered. She strove to deny the strength of the opposition which her orders had aroused in the city, though she knew of the tumults : she protested that it proceeded only from a few, Scottishmen and others.\* Nevertheless she was perplexed. "I do not know what these devils want," she said to the Spanish ambassador in one of their numerous conversations. "They want liberty," answered Guzman, "and unless kings look out for themselves, it is easy to see how it will end. These people, who profess the new religion, display their intention, which is, to disregard superiors and order things in their own way. Take measures in time, and compare the obedience and quietude of the Catholics with the turbulence of the Protestants."† But it was of some Protestants, not of all ; nor of any in contradistinction to Romanensians, that she complained : and she had neither need nor desire to concert measures against her own people, like the miserable kings around her. Whenever the agent of Philip proffered friendly advice for his own ends, she guarded herself, and he found her "a great chatterer." As for books, she and her ministers knew the power of them. It was greater then than it is now : and the memory of the nation was longer. The great age of books was then beginning, much in religious controversy : an age which is now declining, since men are discovering other means of communication.

The less determined Conformists, and the Nonconformist leaders, displayed equal eagerness in seeking the direction or the approbation of their foreign advisers. Horne, Parkhurst, and even Grindal, sought

\* *Spanish Calendar*, 553.

† *Ib.* 590.

to justify themselves to Bullinger and Gualter for having accepted bishoprics with the compliance of the habits and ceremonies; and gained the suffrages of kindly judges.\* Sandys and Jewel, to the same benevolent correspondents, diminished the importance of a small dispute which somewhat disturbed weak minds, lamenting however that any vestiges of popery remained in the churches.† Early in the trouble, on the other hand, Humphrey to Bullinger showed himself not very indisposed to comply. "Tell me," said he, "is that a thing indifferent which is imbued with superstition in the minds of the simple? Or may not a pious man use the habits for the sake of order, not of ornament, at the command of his sovereign, not of the Pope, whose jurisdiction is abolished? That spherical cap, that papistic surplice, are enjoined on the lawful authority of the Queen."‡ But two or three years later, in the time of his great revolt, he propounded the matter to the same tribunal of Bullinger, Gualter, and their colleagues in seven questions; which at the same moment his sterner comrade, Sampson, extended into twelve. "The contest about habits, in which Cranmer, Ridley, and Hooper, all of them blessed martyrs, were wont to skirmish, is now revived with greater determination," said Sampson. "Was a peculiar habit ever assigned to ministers in the better times? Is it consistent with ecclesiastical and Christian liberty? Does the nature of things indifferent admit of coercion? Can new ceremonies, Jewish ceremonies,

\* Horne to Gualter, July 17, 1565.—*Zurich Lett.*, i. 142. Bullinger, or rather Gualter, to Horne in reply, Nov., 1565.—*Ib.* 341. Grindal to Bullinger, Aug., 1566.—*Ib.* 168.

† Sandys to Bullinger, Jan., 1566; Jewel to Bullinger, Feb., 1566.—Strype, *Annals*, ii. 221, and App. Nos. 35, 36; *Zurich Lett.* i. 146, 149.

‡ Humphrey to Bullinger, Aug., 1563.—*Ib.* 134. He mentions that Sampson also was writing to Bullinger.

or idolatrous rites be superadded, revived, or borrowed? Can conformity be required herein; or offensive ceremonies maintained; or ecclesiastical constitutions tolerated which are unedifying although not impious? May ceremonial observances be prescribed by the sovereign without the free and full consent of churchmen? Ought a man deliberately to serve the church on these terms, or else be cast out of the ministry? Consult Gualter and the rest of your colleagues, and send us a written answer to each of these questions.”\* The answer of Bullinger, on behalf of himself and Gualter, to these elaborate demands was wise, tender, and learned, and wholly for conformity. He took the questions both of Humphrey and of Sampson one by one, at the same time exclaiming, “Why divide the subject into so many questions, and twist it into so many knots, whereas it is simple, and can be stated in a few words?” It was indeed simple; it was whether they should comply or not. To the most implicative of Sampson’s points, about the sovereign prescribing ceremonies without the clergy, his answer was that if the sovereign were always to wait for the consent of the clergy, Hezekiah or Josiah would never have got the Levites into proper order: that he would neither have bishops altogether excluded from ecclesiastical deliberations,

\* Humphrey to Bullinger, Feb. 9, 1566; Sampson to Bullinger, Feb. 16, 1566.—*Zurich Lett.* i. 151, 153. It is proper to remind the reader that a large number of the letters of this important correspondence, which is now accessible in the two volumes of the *Zurich Letters* published by the Parker Society, may be found in Strype and Burnet. The latter has generously acknowledged the labours of the former: but to himself belongs the chief honour of having been the first to get the Tigurine archives examined, and laid the most important of their contents before the English nation two centuries ago. He has printed near a score of these letters in the collection to his third part, Pocock’s edition, vol. vi.: and has given a good account of them, vol. iii. 520.



nor by their silence sanction the unjust ordinances of princes, nor usurp the power over princes and magistrates which they had in the times of popery.\* His counsel came too late, as it regarded Sampson, of whose deprivation he received the news a month later.† But he deemed it right to send a copy of this elaborate epistle to the English bishops, on the ground that he and his colleagues “could not hold any private communication with the brethren without the knowledge of the principal ministers.” He sent it to Grindal, Horne, and Parkhurst, requesting them in turn to transmit it to Sandys, Jewel, and Pilkington.‡ Somewhat to his annoyance, the delighted Bishop of London, as it has been seen, immediately published it in Latin and English, and circulated it among the clergy of his diocese. Bullinger’s two correspondents, who according to the rules of human temper had sought rather to be justified than convinced, respectfully expressed themselves dissatisfied with the arguments, and indignantly informed him of the publication of his letter. At the same time they sent him “some straws and chips of the papistic religion,” which still adhered to the Church of England, showing that their discontent went beyond the cap and surplice.§

They next, joined by the venerable Coverdale, turned from Zurich to the other centre of Helvetian opinion, where a successor more Calvinian than the recently departed Calvin himself now reigned: to Beza, Farel, and Viretus at Geneva they addressed an importunate epistle, entering further upon the grounds of

\* Bullinger to Humphrey and Sampson, May 1, 1566.—Strype, *Annals*, i. App. xxiv. (*the Latin*); Collier, vi. 436; *Zurich Lett.* i. 345.

† Abel to Bullinger, June 6, 1566.—*Ib.* ii. 117.

‡ Bullinger to Horne, Grindal, and Parkhurst, May 3, 1566.—Strype, *Annals*, ii. App. xxvi.; *Zurich Lett.* i. 356.

§ Humphrey and Sampson to Bullinger, July, 1566.—*Ib.* 157.

their uneasiness. "An unleavened cake instead of common bread; the Communion taken on bended knees; a square cap, bands, gown and tippet out of doors; the surplice and cope in divine worship: such is the picture of our church! They who refuse to comply are deprived of their fortunes, dignities, and every ecclesiastical office by bishops who are their brethren, bishops who turn, some of them, their houses into the prisons of some preachers! We ought not to seek our pattern out of the puddles of our enemies. External profession ought to be the badge of doctrine: similarity of rites ought not to conjoin us with a religion which we abhor. Publish a treatise to instruct both our church and the Saxon churches. Admonish our bishops by a private letter not to persecute Joseph for his coat. Write privately to any of the Council whom you know: so that this whole controversy may issue in a Christian pacification, not a cruel separation. We think not of the bishops but as becomes friends and brethren. Communicate this letter to all your brethren, that at the mouth of two or three witnesses we may hear what the Lord may speak." \*

A consultation between the theologic throngs ensued, English emissaries passing from one to the other, English malcontents intervening by letters, diversity of opinion elicited, Bullinger finding himself the butt of all because of his epistle, and himself expressing his indignation that his epistle had been published. Indeed the publication of that epistle was a momentous thing. Turner, the violent Dean of Wells, wrote to him, reproaching him severely for his advice, under cover

\* Coverdale, Humphrey, Sampson, to Farel, Viret, Beza, July, 1566.—*Zurich Lett.* ii. 121. The reader will note that they have nothing to say about any proceedings by "the bishops" that we know not of. This description of the cruelties of deprivation is overcharged, especially in their own cases.

of courteously informing him of what was said of him : "Some hold that our Samaritans, the men lame in both feet, have persuaded you by falsehoods to hurl your darts against our poor preachers, concealing the crimes of our principal ministers and others, who have cast so many good pastors into prison, stripped of all their dignities, and have exposed the flock to papists and Lutherans : and all to look like an ass ! Some say that you manifestly contradict your own books. Those who best excuse you say that you wrote it as a literary exercise, and sent it to our friends as men of very great learning : but that nothing was further from your thoughts than that it should be printed and dispersed among the vulgar. I suppose it was published without your knowledge."\* Beza wrote to him a long memorial on the affairs of England, of which, however, he betrayed considerable ignorance, affirming that "the Papacy was never abolished in that country, but rather transferred to the sovereign." In the long enumeration of abuses which he made, it might be noticed that there was the power of the Queen to take further order in ceremonies with the consent of the metropolitan : a power which we have seen to have been bestowed by the Act for Uniformity. Beza appears to have got his information of English affairs from an English emissary, who went from him to Bullinger ; of whom anon.† Parkhurst wrote to Bullinger telling him that he had received from the Bishop of London a copy of his epistle printed both in Latin and English.‡ Grindal wrote to him that he had "taken care that it should be printed both in Latin and English," and dwelling with joy on the good

\* Turner to Bullinger, July 23, 1566.—*Zurich Lett.* ii. 124.

† Beza to Bullinger, Sept. 3, 1566.—*Ib.* 128.

‡ Parkhurst to Bullinger, Aug. 21, 1566.—*Ib.* i. 165.



effects of it. "Many of the more learned ministers," said he, "seemed on the point of forsaking their ministry: many of the people were meditating a secession, and setting up secret meetings: but through the goodness of the Lord the greatest part are returned to a better mind. Your letter, replete with piety and wisdom, has chiefly turned the scale. They find that our ceremonies are not considered unlawful by you, though you use them not: but of this no one could have persuaded them before the publication of your letter."\* On the other hand, Bullinger and Gualter wrote to Grindal and Horne in dignified and respectful terms, remarking on the publication of their private letter, and the encouragement which had thus been given beyond the vestimentary question, of which alone it was written, to many abuses. Of these abuses they got their information whence Beza obtained his.† Bullinger and Gualter wrote also to Humphrey and Sampson, declining to enter further into the dispute, regretting the publication of the letter.‡ Bullinger wrote to Coverdale the same day, protesting that he never meant the letter to have been published, and never desired to have obtruded his advice.§ Gualter wrote to Parkhurst the next day, lamenting the publication of the letter, diligently explaining and protesting, speaking of abuses, reminding the English bishops of the faithless steward in the parable who rioted with the drunken and smote his lord's household, congratulating Parkhurst and Pilkington upon having refused

\* Grindal to Bullinger, Aug. 27, 1566.—*Zurich Lett.* i. 168. "Multi ex plebe contulerunt consilia de secessione a nobis facienda, et occultis cœtibus cogendis."—*Ib.* 100, Lat.

† Bullinger and Gualter to Grindal and Horne, Sept. 6.—*Ib.* 357.

‡ Bullinger and Gualter to Humphrey and Sampson, Sept. 10.—*Ib.* 360.

§ Bullinger to Coverdale, Sept. 10.—*Ib.* ii. 136.

to eject any one.\* Of this distinct renunciation it so happened that Parkhurst made several copies, which he kept not so secret but that they fell into the hands of some of the Nonconformists, who immediately printed it, along with a letter from Beza. This was a smart requital of Grindal's unwarrantable doing: and had great success. The pamphlet, which was entitled *An Admonition to Parliament*, went through four editions in as many years, in spite of the restraint of the press: and it had a further history, to be hereafter told.†

In this great effort to win the approbation of the foreign throngs, the Discontented Brethren or Nonconformists sent abroad several messengers, who passed from Zurich to Geneva relating the miserable state of their own country. Not only had it surplises and copes, they represented, and all that hung thereon, but it had vast and manifold abuses. Some of these were real, some fictitious, their own grievances or mistakes. Ministers admitted at the will of the bishops only, without the concurrence and call of the brethren: subscription to the Prayer Book: oaths of the sovereign to be supreme head: the papal discipline of deans, chancellors, and archdeacons, instead of a presbytery: marriage of clergy forbidden, unless by the consent of the Queen, the bishop, and some justices: Papists left in possession of their benefices and offices on taking oath to maintain the Reformation. Such were some of the woes that reached the ear of Beza. Organs; the infant addressed through the godparents by the minister in baptism; private baptism by women in case of necessity allowed; the ring in marriage; women churched in

\* Gualter to Parkhurst, Sept. 11.—*Zurich Lett.* ii. 140. The comparison of the English bishops with the faithless steward gave great and just offence.

† Strype's *Parker*, 348.

veils; all kinds of licenses sold in the Court of Faculties of the metropolitan; assent to ceremonies required by subscribing; one of the Articles, which under King Edward took away the Real Presence, now altered, mutilated, and imperfect; no discipline. Such were some of the blemishes that were displayed to Bullinger. And things still stronger were alleged to him: that a foreign language was used in the services of the Church of England, exorcisms, breathings, oil, clay, spittle, and lighted tapers. One of the agents or messengers who carried these curious reports was Percival Wiburn, of St. John's College in Cambridge, a returned exile, a prebendary of Winchester and Rochester, who had been deprived. The worst of them were imputed to him: but Withers and Barthlett had as great a hand in them. It might be observed that some of them were merely the resolutions proposed and narrowly lost in the late great Convocation; in all of which Wiburn had voted. For the rest, Lutheranism had receded very far in the estimation of all these correspondents. "They will fill the churches with Lutherans and Papists," said the Nonconformists. "We think as little of Lutherans as you think," answered the less determined Conformists. An embassy to England, to reconcile the parties, was proposed; for which Gualter was considered the most likely person: but Gualter himself closed the way against himself. Bullinger and Gualter wrote an urgent pacificatory letter to their patron, the Earl of Bedford:\* but nothing else was done.

Nor at this juncture was the voice of the Church of Scotland, as it was reduced by John Knox, unheard for the direction of England. Knox himself, visiting Cambridge under leave to see his sons, brought a letter

\* *Zurich Lett.* ii. 137.



from the Edinburgh Assembly, "to their brethren the Bishops and Pastors of England": and the earliest address of the new Presbyterian senate to the Anglican hierarchy is not devoid of interest. It was not an unworthy, though a characteristic document. Lamenting, with some lack of consciousness, the heat of the dispute; refusing to enter into the merits, and yet entirely determining for the Nonconformists, designating the habits and ceremonies of the Conformists by the names of Roman rags, and dregs of the Roman Beast; it exhorted the bishops not to trouble for vain trifles those who neither condemned nor molested them. Otherwise it was dignified and solemn. Admitting the prelates to the name of brethren, the Scottish ministers and elders, granting in themselves "no great worldly pomp," made their humble supplication for lenity, and hoped "not to be so far despised" as not to be accounted of the number of them that fought against the Roman Antichrist, and travailed to advance the kingdom of the Lord Jesus.\* This message was occasioned by the messengers and letters which the Nonconformists sent into Scotland.

The survey of Christendom, beyond the Roman obedience, afforded now the Lutheran or Saxon churches maintaining many of the old rites and ceremonies, that is to say, an outward resemblance to the former religion or worship, and in doctrine the Real Presence, without episcopacy: the Reformed churches rejecting the outward resemblance and episcopacy, and in doctrine the Calvinists maintaining (according to the teaching of Calvin), the Zwinglians denying, the

\* The Ministers and Elders of the Churches within the Realm of Scotland to their Brethren the Bishops and Pastors of England, who have renounced the Roman Antichrist, &c., Dec. 27, 1566.—Strype's *Parker*, 230, and App. li.; Collier, vi. 433. Also in *Part of a Register*, p. 125.

Real Presence: Sweden maintaining the outward resemblance and episcopacy, but not the Real Presence: the other Scandinavian churches the same, but more doubtfully: Scotland maintaining the Real Presence, denying the outward resemblance and episcopacy: England maintaining all three, with a party within her fold which sought to abolish the outward resemblance, murmured against the recent reiteration of the doctrine of the Real Presence, and was not unready to reject episcopacy, misliking therewith the church courts, the archdeacons and rural deans, and men to be admitted into the ministry by the bishop alone without the consent of the rest of the ministry.

The dregs of the plague lurking in Oxford had diverted the Queen's intention of proceeding thither two years before, at or before the time when Cambridge received her visit. A sufficient interval had removed the obstacle, cooled rivalry, and brought the day when the former University might also receive an equal honour. At the end of August the Chancellor, who was the Earl of Leicester, the Secretary Cecil, Throckmorton, Knowles, and a large company of nobles and gentlemen, arrived at Oxford from Woodstock, and were received by Doctor Kennall the Vice-chancellor, and the Heads, the scholars standing in order within Christ Church quadrangle. A violent rain frustrated the ceremony, and drove the visitors into Kennall's lodgings in Merton College, where, however, orations were made by Potts of the House and by Benson to Leicester and the Secretary respectively; and the Secretary proposed the truly profound question: Why Aristotle should have written a treatise on monarchy at a time when there was not a monarch in the world? So to dinner: after which three bachelors of Christ Church were called in, who disputed admirably

on another question which the Secretary gave, of course in Latin : Whether riches or poverty more conduced to the pursuit of learning ? Part of the company returned in the afternoon to the Queen at Woodstock : Leicester and some other persons of quality, who remained, visited the Schools the next morning, heard Doctor Humphrey, the Regius Professor, lecture in the Divinity School to his great commendation, and afterwards witnessed some disputations in that Faculty. In the evening came with a noble retinue the Queen. There is a place—the liberties end there—between Oxford and Woodstock, by name Wolvercot. Thither repaired Leicester the Chancellor, four doctors in their scarlet robes, Kennall, Humphrey, Goodwin the new Dean of Christ Church (Sampson was in Gaza), and White the Warden of New College : eight other Heads : three Esquire Beadles. The royal train arriving, the Beadles delivered their staves to her Majesty : she to the Chancellor. An oration was spoken by the former Orator, Marbeck, the Provost of Oriel, and was graciously acknowledged, the Spanish ambassador, Guzman, remarking upon the admirable fullness and compression of the performance. She gave the doctors her hand to kiss : and while Humphrey bowed over it said to him, “ Doctor Humphrey, methinks this gown and habit becomes you very well : I marvel that you are so strait-laced on this point : but I come not now to chide.” Perhaps her words wrought with that learned man, to make of him another Humphrey.

Entering the city from the north, through the memorable gate of Bocardo, which was new white-washed and ablaze with emblems, she was met by the spokesman of the scholars of Oxford, a sophist named Deal, of New College, with a gratulatory oration.



The scholars of Oxford lined the street on either side from Bocardo to Carfax, and fell on their knees as her litter passed: for she rode not on horseback, but in a litter drawn by mules for the weather and her recent illness. A multitude of people thronged and shouted behind the scholars. At Carfax a gratulatory oration was pronounced in Greek by Lawrence, the Regius Professor, a gifted man: to which she replied briefly in the same language that it was "the best Greek speech she had ever heard."\* From Carfax to Christ Church the street was lined on either side with bachelors and masters: at the porch of Christ Church, the Orator of the University, Kingsmill, spoke a third oration in Latin: and the friend and relation of Pilkington failed not to give a turn to his eloquence: Kingsmill, a youth in years, a man in wisdom, and a fellow of All Souls. "Of all the benefits that your royal goodness has conferred upon this academy," said Kingsmill, "the greatest is this, that you have brought back out of Germany so many pious sons of Peter Martyr and of Martin Bucer: that in the chair of divinity here, where Peter Martyr sat, you have deservedly installed the choicest hearer that Peter Martyr had, making him his heir who was his equal save in that in which son must needs be inferior to father. I speak of Doctor Humphrey."† To this

\* Hallam has noticed this occasion. "An address was delivered in Greek verses to Elizabeth at Cambridge in 1564: to which she returned thanks in the same language. Oxford would not be outdone: Lawrence, Regius Professor of Greek, made an oration at Carfax, a spot often chosen for public exhibition, on her visit to the city in 1566: when her majesty, thanking the university in the same tongue, observed, it was the best Greek speech she had ever heard."—*Lit. of Europe*, i. 514. She told Lawrence further that she would have answered him "presently," but that she was somewhat abashed by the great company, and would talk more with him in her chamber.—Nichols' *Progresses*, i. 208.

† "P. Martyris selectissimum auditorem P. Martyris meritissimum

effusion the Queen tartly replied, "You would have done well, had you had good matter." As she passed through the quadrangle to the cathedral church, she was hailed in scrolls of Greek and Latin verse, hung along her path, of which some, resounding her praises and welcome, reminded her demurely that she was traversing the unfinished, if stately, foundation of her sire.\* She entered the church, the students of Christ Church crying "Vivat Regina!" standing orderly in their surplices, a canopy borne over her by four doctors, and ascended to a traviis made for her in the choir. Evensong with prayers of thanksgiving was said by the Dean, a *Te Deum* sung to cornets being inserted. She and her Court, a splendid train of nobles and ladies, dispersed to their various lodgings in the precincts of the college.

The next morning, being Sunday, two sermons were preached in Christ Church: but the Queen was only at one of them, in the afternoon. In Christ Church Hall in the evening a Latin play was enacted, called *Marcus Geminus*, all the nobility being present, but not the Queen. The Spanish ambassador particularly admired this performance.† He went the next morning, with divers of the nobles, to the Schools, to hear the ordinary lectures and disputations: for it was arranged that all should be kept during the royal visit

hæredem fecisti, patri certe suo sola ætate inferiorem."—Nichols' *Progresses*, i. 209. This is an important testimony to the high estimation in which Humphrey was held. To make him Peter Martyr's equal was the highest word that could have been spoken. Martyr was recently dead. Nothing could exceed the admiration with which such a man as Bishop Jewel regarded Martyr.

\* *Grata venis nobis, perfectaue gaudia portas,  
Imperfecta tui subiens monumenta parentis.*—*Ib.*

So sang Calfhill.

† "Multa vidi, sed hæc sunt admiranda: et sic referam ubi in patriam venero," was his comment.—*Ib.* 210.

as in full term. The most part of the time was spent in listening to Dr. Humphrey, whose lecture was much commended. The Queen kept within doors that day, and was visited by the Hebrew professor, Neal, who presented her with his translation of the Prophets, and a little book of Latin verses containing the description of all the colleges, the schools and halls, with the names and times of founders.\* In the evening the Queen witnessed an English play, made by the poet Edwards, named *Palamon and Arcite*, performed in Christ Church Hall. The fall of a part of the stage at the beginning killed and wounded several persons, but was not allowed to stop the spectacle. The Queen sent her own surgeon to the wounded, and laughed heartily at a comedy, which descended to midnight but not to posterity.†

The rest of the week was occupied mainly with disputations in natural and moral philosophy and in divinity: which were held in St. Mary's church. But the records of these exercitations are scanty and broken: the interest of them is little more than

\* Neal's verses are ingeniously composed as a dialogue between the Queen and Leicester, before she starts from Woodstock for Oxford. She asks the learned Chancellor for information about the place, and he describes it. They were first edited by Hearne from the Bodleian MS. They are in Nichols' *Progresses*, i. 217.

† As *Palamon and Arcite* was acted with great mirth, it may have been "a tragical comedy" perhaps; like Lyly's *Alexander and Campaspe* a little later. It was tragical in another sense, in the performance, and the death of the author followed a month or two later. Richard Edwards is well known as the chief contributor to the *Paradise of Dainty Devices*, and author of several exquisite lyrics. His play of *Palamon* is not extant. His former play of *Daphne* was said to have been so good that nothing could be better: but *Palamon* so much excelled it, that it was said that if he wrote another, he would die or go mad. *Palamon* was in two parts. When it was acted, there was a hunt by Theseus' train in Christ Church quadrangle, which the college youth took to be real, to the Queen's great amusement.



incidental or personal. The doors of St. Mary's and the walls were covered with verses in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew ; and a map descriptive of the colleges and halls, the work of Neal, hung there for several days. Within the church a large scaffold for the disputations repeated the arrangements of Cambridge, and reached from the west end to the door of the choir. Near the upper end was a travis for the Queen facing west, with a partition on the right for the Council and nobles, on the left for the ladies and maids of honour, with whom sat the Spanish ambassador. The doctors sat in front of the Queen, with the Chancellor among them : and further away the Masters of Arts. In natural philosophy the respondent was Edmund Campion, of St. John's, a sweet and tragic name, here written first. Richard Bristow, of Exeter, was one of his opponents : who was afterwards deprived for Romanism. In civil law the Queen would have Doctor Thomas White, of New College, proceed to the end, so well she liked him, when the Moderator, Kennall, would have cut him short. In divinity the respondent was Humphrey, who was opposed by seven, of whom were Goodwin and Calhill : the Moderator was Bishop Jewel ; and the questions were : Whether a bad prince ought to be obeyed ? and, Whether the ministry of the word implied lordship ? On the former, Doctor Humphrey courteously entreated of the happy presence of the Queen, her pacific reign, of himself and other doctors, that they abhorred sedition and tumult : concluding that even bad princes were to be obeyed by divine precept. Dr. Goodwin advanced that tyrannicide was lawful both among Gentiles and Jews : the still bolder Calhill, asking the Queen to pardon his figments for the sake of argument, first alleged that there ought to be no prince, then that a bad prince

might be killed. "It is lawful for any private man to consult the interests of the republic," said Doctor Overton, "and this is done excellent well by killing a bad prince." "No, it is not," said the respondent. "St. Jerome speaks of smiting a bad prince," said Doctor Overton. "Yes, with the sword of excommunication," said the respondent. The question was searched apparently with keenness by other doctors; the disputation lasted through the late summer evening till lights were brought, the delight of the audience banishing all sense of weariness; and was decided finally by Jewel in a learned speech, in which he extolled the eloquence of the respondent, proved from the Scriptures and the examples of the saints the obedience due to the royal power, expounding at full the behaviour of Paul towards Nero, and of David to Saul. Upon the second very delicate question that had been proposed, he said that he preferred not to enter, unless the Queen so commanded. He ended with a panegyric congratulation of her Majesty.\* "Vivat Regina!" was the universal cry: and the nobles, turning towards her, with supplicating boldness asked her to deign to address the academy. She, long reluctant, urged the suddenness, her learning unequal, the erudite audience, the quizzical witnesses, in particular the Spanish ambassador, who might give a fine

\* None will refuse to be pleased with the late Mr. Froude's description of Elizabeth's visit to "the fairest of her cities in its autumnal robe of sad and mellow loveliness": but it is not a representation of the time. He transports the half-imaginary parties of his own time into hers. There are the parties of "orthodox suspicion" looking askance on "the keener intellects climbing the stairs of the temple of Modern Science."—*Hist.* viii. 292. There is nothing like this in the reality. He is very unjust to Humphrey in saying that he "deserted his friends to gain favour with the Queen." He merely took the part of respondent, which somebody must have taken if there was to be any disputation: and thought no more of gaining her favour than Calhill of losing it.

account of her when he got home. She begged the Spaniard to speak for her. When he would not, nor would Leicester, nor would Cecil, she rose, and with a low voice pronounced a frank and touching Latin oration. "If an evildoer hates the light of detection, I may shun your presence. I cannot speak without betraying my deficient learning: and yet silence might argue contempt. The time is spent, I must be brief: I will divide my matter into praise and blame: to you the praise, to me the blame. I have seen and heard many things in this academy: I have approved all. But let me say that those theses which you yourselves deprecated when you propounded them, I neither can as a queen, nor should as a Christian approve. However, I was not annoyed with the disputation, since you constantly added a salve or apology. As to the blame, it is mine. I have been carefully educated: I deny not that I have some knowledge of the many languages in which I have been instructed: many learned tutors have done their best for me: but the soil was sterile, and has borne no fruits worthy of my rank, their labours, or your expectation. You have lauded me abundantly without altering my judgment of myself. My wish for you is, that you may flourish while I live, and gather glory when I am dead."\* Thus

\* There are two versions of the Queen's oration, which are both given in Nichols' *Progresses*. The first was made by Humphrey, and printed in his *Life of Jewel*. It may also be seen in Fuller's *Church History*, Bk. ix. It is the more complete and elegant. The other was taken by another eye-witness, Robinson, Dean, afterwards Bishop, of Bangor: who made notes of the whole entertainment. He could not hear all that she said, but gave "quæ ex submissa ejus voce arripere potui." It is imperfect, and not very coherent. The passage about the disputation stands thus: "Quæ vero sunt per se (something lost) cum cautione et exceptione semper addita, nec mea autoritate ut Regina, nec judicio ut Christiana probō."—Nichols, 243. In Humphrey's version it is, "At ea quibus in prologis vos ipsi excusastis, neque probare ut Regina possum, neque ut Christiana debeo. Ceterum quia in exordio semper adhibuistis cautionem, mihi sane illa



fearlessly could Elizabeth cast herself upon the hearts of her subjects, even in the elaborate observance of a University. Among the critics whom she may have professed to fear were some of the magnates of Cambridge, who were come to be incorporated: among them her favourite, the eloquent Preston. Nor had Oxford forgotten that question of the comparative antiquity of herself and Cambridge.\*

In the evening, in Christ Church Hall, a Latin tragedy was played before the Queen, *Tereus and Progne*, made by Calphill. It had applause, he received her thanks: but it took not half so well as the comedy of *Palamon and Arcite*. There were many other acts, entertainments, exercitations, orations, sermons, in other colleges and churches than where she was; to divide her company, and display the learned gymnasium. The preparation was perfect, the execution admirable; but the delicate state of the Queen's health took away somewhat: preventing her, for example, from making

disputatio non displicuit." Humphrey's account of the speech is interesting: he describes the Queen rising at last, "ad extremum suum quasi epiphonema regium apponens." He gives her speech as well as he could hear it, "respondentis in loco, et in cathedra theologica procul constitutus": but a subject cannot express such eloquence more than a mouse the lion's roar.—*Life of Jewel*, 243. And yet the mouse seems to have been great cause why the lion's roar was so gentle. In Robinson's version the Queen's Latin approaches the Queen's English more nearly. Such a phrase as "haud ita stupida sum" sounds native.

\* The vaunt of Masters at Cambridge two years before, had been taken up by Doctor Thomas Key, or Caius, Master of University College, in an *Assertio Antiquitatis Oxoniensis Academiae*, which he now presented to the Queen by the hand of the Chancellor. This drew him afterwards into controversy with Doctor John Key, or Caius, of Cambridge, who published in 1568 an anonymous work, *De Antiquitate Cantabrigiæ Academiae*, in which he maintained the greater antiquity of Cambridge. Thomas Key retorted. Both these tractates were reprinted by Hearne in Oxford. It was no less a person than Archbishop Parker who called the Cambridge Caius into the field, for the honour of his University: yea, and armed him with weapons.—Strype's *Parker*, 257.

the circuit of the colleges, which had been designed. On Friday, September 6, she took her departure, riding in state from Christ Church to Carfax, and thence along High Street to Magdalen College and East Bridge, the scholars standing in order on either side. The walls of St. Mary's, All Souls, and University College were hung with countless sheets of verses of lament: a fashion of compliment too operose and too literary for any University in modern days to afford to any sovereign. The learned offered their only treasures, their books, their works, to her acceptance. As she left Christ Church, Tobias Matthew, afterwards Archbishop of York, spoke an oration before her, and was rewarded with the title of her scholar. As she proceeded, "her sweet, affable, and noble carriage left such impressions in the minds of scholars, that nothing but emulation was in their studies." When she reached the bridge, the final oration was delivered by Marbeck with an admirable liveliness. As she went beyond the liberties her face was still towards Oxford, and her last words were, "Farewell, thou worthy University of Oxford; farewell, my dear scholars, and pray God prosper your studies." Upon this high occasion the chief honours lay with Humphrey: but nearly all did their parts well. Among the disputers and orators Lawrence, Overton, afterwards Bishop of Lichfield, and Bristow shone.

After half a dozen prorogations, the impatience of the nation compelled the prudence of Elizabeth to call her second Parliament to begin a second Session on the last of September: a Session almost barren of legislation, though marked by hot debates. The question of her marriage and the succession of the throne was carried to such a pitch between the sovereign and the temporal Estates that it threatened a breach. The

fiery spirit of Elizabeth was chafed by the resolutions, memorials, arguments, and deputations of the Houses : her imperious messages awoke in turn the dangerous cry of privilege among the Commons. She withdrew her messages with dignity and skill as soon as she perceived the temper that they were arousing : she refused with grace the bribe of an unlimited money grant that the Commons offered as the price of a matrimonial settlement, which, however, she gave some signs of yielding : but at the beginning of January she dissolved them ; and she rated them from the throne, so as elected burghers were never rated before or have been since. She was right. It was for the safety, it was for the greatness of England that she should remain as she was for her lifetime : and it was not in the counsels of the King of kings that England should have another Tudor.

Of laws touching the Church of this Session, there was but one of any moment, and that was merely declaratory : "An Act declaring the making and consecrating of the archbishops and bishops of this realm to be good, lawful, and perfect."\* It might better have been named an Act declaring the English Ordinal to be of the like authority in the realm as the English Prayer Book, and to be part of the English Prayer Book ; although for good reason, and not by accidental omission, the Ordinal had not been mentioned particularly in the Act for Uniformity of the first year of Elizabeth. This Declaration arose out of Bonner's plea against Horne, two years before ; which had appeared so grave to the justices, as touching the legal position of all Elizabeth's bishops, that they desired it to be decided by Parliament rather than tried by a jury. Their prudence was laudable, in that

\* 8 Eliz. c. 1.



if, in that one case, local interest or passion had sustained the plea, many bargains, leases, exchanges, and other contracts would have been disputed or annulled on the like pretext everywhere, and general disturbance would have ensued. But they made too much of the occasion when in their Act they dealt with the whole question of the legal appointing of bishops in the realm. The Act rehearsed that "divers questions had grown by overmuch boldness of speech among the common sort of people upon the making and consecrating of bishops, whether the same were duly and orderly done according to the law or not," and "evil speech was used against the high state of prelacy." And no doubt the alleged defect of Parliamentary sanction of the English Ordinal was greatly the cause of this, being easily confused by the popular mind with some deficiencies supposed in the Ordinal itself as a rite. But, presently, the Act itself, which was now passed to declare the Ordinal a part of the Prayer Book, standing on the same authority as the rest of it, was perversely represented as an attempt made too late to remedy such imperfections. It pleased the Romanensians to entertain and spread this opinion.\* It has pleased the Roman

\* Sanders says, after giving his story about consecration vainly sought from Creagh of Armagh, "Atque ita cum omni legitima ordinatione destituti vulgo dicerentur, et ipsis legibus Anglicanis vere probarentur non esse episcopi, brachiumulare invocare coacti sunt, ut laici magistratus confirmationem in futuris comitiis acciperent: cujus auctoritate, si quid minus rite nec ad præscriptum legum in priori inauguratione gestum esset, aut omisum, ipsis condonaretur, idque postquam episcopali officio et cathedra, absque ulla episcopali consecratione, aliquot annis jam functi fuissent. Hinc nomen illis impositum, ut Parlamentarii Episcopi dicerentur."—*De Schism.* lib. iii. p. 279 (ed. 1628). He attributes to the scruples of the clergy an Act that was due to the fears of the lawyers. Champneys gives the misinterpretation of the Act in a somewhat interesting way: that Chief Justice Brooks in Mary's reign, in a report published in Elizabeth's reign, says that it was asserted that the bishops made in Edward's reign were never consecrated,

Catholics since to repeat it: and the Act has figured largely in their catalogues of their reasons against the Church of England. Certainly this cumbrous performance lent itself to misrepresentation. The vast preamble recapitulated all that had gone before in the Reformation on the appointing of bishops, even from King Henry's Statute of Annates, which was for making them within the realm. To this it referred in a manner that might make the unwary think that the English Ordinal was composed in Henry's reign.\* It evolved Edward, Philip and Mary, Elizabeth, and her first statutes and her "Supplentes" clause: and then it proceeded to ordain that all bishops elected and consecrated by the Queen's letters patent or commissions, and ordered and consecrated according to the form prescribed in the Ordinal, should be declared, judged, and deemed good and perfect bishops, notwithstanding anything to the contrary that could or might be objected. Instead of all this legal labour a brief historical explanation would have sufficed to show why Elizabeth's first Parliament, in reviving Edward's Prayer Book, had not by name revived his Ordinal. It was because his Ordinal had been by name already formally joined to his Prayer Book, "to be of like force and value," by his last Act for Uniformity, the Act which Elizabeth

and were no bishops: that in Elizabeth's reign the judges greatly questioned the ordinations of bishops in Edward's reign: and that the same judgment must be made concerning Elizabeth's bishops, who were consecrated by the same Ordinal. Brooks died before Elizabeth's accession, though the Report was published after it. See Courayer, *Defence of Validity*, p. 134.

\* "The late King Henry the Eighth, in the five and twentieth year of his reign, did by authority of Parliament set forth a certain order of the manner and form how archbishops and bishops within this realm and other his dominions should be elected and made." This refers to 25 H. 8, c. 20: on which comp. Vol. I. p. 181 of this work. Any one on reading it might think that Henry had authorised an Ordinal by that statute.

revived. There was therefore no need to specify the Ordinal again in reviving that Act. But the Ordinal had not been joined to the Prayer Book before Edward's last Act for Uniformity because at the time of his first Act for Uniformity the Ordinal had not been made :\* therefore it was necessary to specify it in his last Act for Uniformity. Bonner's plea against Horne, which seemed to challenge the legal position of all the bishops, was run down by the lawyers into a single point, the lack of mention of the Ordinal in the Act of Elizabeth for Uniformity : but they were too flurried and laborious in defending that point, which really needed no defence, much less a wall, a ditch, and a rampart.† For the rest, as Bonner's fight had been against Horne's certificate, and not a random onslaught, it was provided, at the end of the Act, that no person should suffer by means of any certificate heretofore made by any bishop : and that all tenders of the Oath, and all refusals of it, should be of none effect up to that time. This was right and merciful. The Act passed the Lords with eleven dissentients : Northumberland, Westmorland, Worcester, Sussex, Montague, Morley, Dudley, Dacre, Monteagle, Cromwell,

\* When Edward's first Act for Uniformity, 1549, was passed, there was no English Ordinal. If there had been, it would probably have been tacitly included, not expressly, as part of the Prayer Book, in the Act. A commission was soon afterwards appointed by Parliament to draw up the Ordinal (see Vol. III. p. 159 of this work). Their work (after revision, like the Prayer Book itself) was joined expressly with the Prayer Book in Edward's second Act for Uniformity. There was no need to mention them separately again.

† If the Spanish ambassador was right, the bishops themselves petitioned Parliament to have their position confirmed. "The Protestant bishops have petitioned Parliament to the effect that although they are legitimate prelates without need of further confirmation, certain malicious persons question it, and to overcome this inconvenience and others, they ask to be confirmed in their office by Parliament."—*Span. Cal.* 588.



and Mordaunt. In the debate Sussex distinguished himself.\*

A Bill to take away sanctuary was defeated by the vigour of Goodman, the Dean of Westminster, who represented to the Commons the privilege of his community. A day was assigned him: he appeared at the bar of the House with his counsel, the great lawyer Plowden and a civilian. He pleaded the grant of King Lucius, Plowden more authentically the charter of Edward the Confessor: the matter was examined and the Bill thrown out by seventeen.

Another piece of attempted legislation was passed by the Commons, read in the Lords, and stopped by the Queen. It was a "Bill with a little Book for the sound Christian Religion."† The Book was the Elizabethan Articles of Religion of the Convocation of 1563: the Bill was an attempt made by the Commons, with whom it originated, to exact subscription to the Articles from the clergy. It was "stayed by commandment of the Queen,"‡ who con-

\* 8 Eliz. c. 1. The talk of the day is given by Guzman: "It was passed with the proviso that only the acts that they have done in the discharge of their office were confirmed, excepting, however, all matters relating to life or property. The exception regarding life is explained by the Oath which they demanded from Bonner, the good Bishop of London, and others: and they say that this is the principal reason why they asked for a confirmation: though they gave out that it was for other reasons. They are sorry that there is an exception as to temporal property, as they have no definition of what property is meant: and as they have not dealt fairly with their church properties, they suspect an attempt to bring them to book. But I understand the intention is to prevent loss of temporal goods by those who refuse the Oath."—*Span. Cal.* 596; Froude, viii. 304.

† D'Ewes' *Journals*, p. 132. Hardwick says that the "little Book" was the second English edition, in very small octavo, printed by Jugge and Cawood.—*Hist. of the Articles*, chap. vi.

‡ *Lords' Journals*, Dec. 14. The entry is merely that "An Act for Uniformity in Doctrine was read prima vice," having come up from the Commons.

sidered that the Commons were interfering with her prerogative as Governor of the Church of England. The bishops in the House of Lords are said to have manifested eagerness that it should proceed, and to have been supported by Leicester. A week afterwards the two Archbishops waited on the Queen, who received them with anger: that it was they, or some of the other bishops, who had put the Bill into Parliament without her knowledge and assent. They denied it: Parker knew nothing about it, either how it came into the Commons, or had heard it read in the Lords.\* She bade them make enquiry among their brethren, and report to her. They did so in a week: the Archbishop of York (Canterbury being sick) brought her the returned answer: and she professed herself satisfied. But almost at the same moment she received a formal petition, signed by both the archbishops and thirteen bishops of both provinces, that she would let the Bill have course, and, if it passed, give it her royal assent, for the glory of God, the salvation of souls, the advancement of true religion, and the utility of the realm: and that she would not let the Session end without this.

The underwalks of this piece of history may perhaps be worth the glance of the historically curious reader. Who led the Queen to impute the Bill to the bishops? The Romanensians, helped by the Spanish ambassador. Parker said that she was "disquieted with information," particularly in Cecil's absence. Guzman wrote to Philip that "the Catholics were in great disquiet because the heretic bishops were to be enabled by Parliament to urge forward their evil designs and

\* Parker's *Corresp.* 291, 293; *Cal. Dom.* 284. It is pleasant, though needless, to record Parker's veracity confirmed by the *Lords' Journals*, which mark him not present on the day that the Bill was read.

establish their heresies, and they had asked him to urge the Queen not to give her assent to what Parliament might adopt, as they feared it would be passed by a large number." \* He went to see her on the very day that the Bill was read in the Lords: and the consequence of his interview was that when the Bill was read, the Lord Chancellor had in his hand the Queen's prohibition of going further. How behaved themselves the bishops when the Bill was read in the Lords? They showed themselves, says Guzman, very eager for it, and Leicester stood with them; but high words arose between Leicester and Grindal. If so, Grindal seems, characteristically, to have taken the other side. Nevertheless his name is among those who signed the petition to the Queen to let the Bill run. How treated the Queen the Archbishops when they waited upon her concerning this business? According to Guzman, she refused to see them for two days, and on the third day "she treated them in such a manner that they came out very crestfallen." This is not altogether likely. Parker says nothing such. But they were so received that Parker remarked "the world is full of offences, and displeasure contained." When the Queen cut short the Session and dissolved the Parliament instead of proroguing it, the Romanensians held that they had the best of it, both as to the succession and as to religion.†

\* Froude, viii. 329; *Span. Cal.* 603.

† *Ib.* 606.



## CHAPTER XXXIX.

ELIZABETH.—A.D. 1567-1569.

GRINDAL, and with him Horne, found it necessary to write to Bullinger and Gualter a justification or apology for the publication of their letter. "We did it upon due consideration: we took care to omit the names of brothers Sampson and Humphrey, to whom it was addressed: it has been of the greatest use. Not only has it persuaded some of the clergy not to deprive the churches of their ministry for a trivial cause, but it has pacified the laity who were excited by importunate clamours, making parties, and loudly abusing godly ministers. If it has not satisfied the sour and obstinate, it has checked their foolish and abusive discourses. Some of these ministers, we sorrowfully confess, have been deprived, through their own fault: but they are few, and if pious not learned. Sampson is the only learned man among them. If we had published your admirable letter in support of any other matter than the vestiary question, or if it had been possible to wrest it to any other purpose, it would have been as manifest injustice to you, as it is calumny to us to report that we are requiring ministers either to subscribe to a set of new Articles, or to leave their charge. There is nothing whatever in controversy among us but the habits: and as for those emissaries and their fine stories about organs, foreign tongue, oil, spittle, exorcisms, and such like,

it is all ridiculous. We scarcely accept one of those points, much less impose them on others. We receive, it is true, the interrogation to infants, the cross in baptism, and kneeling at the Lord's Supper: until the Lord shall give us better times. We tolerate the Court of Faculties of the metropolitan: but it is because it is the court of the sovereign: and we ourselves cease not to speak against fiscal abuses and all matters of the kind; and every minister is at full liberty to do the like. It is not true that the whole management of the Church is in the hands of the bishops. In our Convocations the number of the clergy is three times that of the bishops. The metropolitan is anxious and active in washing away the dregs of Rome."\* There is something in this letter that cannot be admired.

Wiburn, who was now returned from Zurich and Geneva, found himself charged with having invented the calumnies of which these bishops complained. He waited upon Horne, who was in London, and expostulated seriously, demanding the reason of the rumour. He was shown Bullinger's former horrified letter about the deformities of the Church of England, the oil, spittle, exorcisms, and the rest: and of this he was allowed to read a few sentences. The matter was thought fit for Cecil's notice: and Cecil sent for him privately, and recommended him, if he were innocent of telling such lies, to procure a few words in writing from Bullinger to clear him. Hereupon he wrote to Bullinger an earnest supplication, recalling the incidents of his visit to him. "You were ill, excellent sir, when an obscure individual visited you last summer: and though I was kindly entertained at your table, I con-

\* Grindal and Horne to Bullinger and Gualter, Feb. 6, 1567.—*Zurich Lett.* i. 175.

versed with you but little, by Divine Providence. You sent for me from my lodgings by your son, and desired me to say what I would, Master Gualter being also present; and you will remember that I made no lengthy complaint about the distress and misery of our Church, because I thought that you were informed of all. I placed in your hands two schedules; and was dismissed to my lodgings in such a way that in the meantime I said not a word on any given point in religion. Afterwards, during the two days that I was waiting for your letter, it is certain that I had no conversation with yourself or others, save that I asked a few questions about habits and ceremonies in general of one or two of your congregation. But on my return home I am charged with detraction, as if I had studied to give you a false relation of our Church: and I find myself in danger. I ask you to send me a letter which may serve them for an answer." Wiburn had given a schedule or list of the abuses, real or pretended, existing in England: but not a ridiculous list.\*

The other Nonconforming emissaries, Withers and Barthlett, were likewise impelled to vindicate themselves: and being still abroad they did it in a larger, a more vivacious manner. The disgusted Bullinger read them the letter of Grindal and Horne. They took it piecemeal, but rebutted it only partially, in writing. "These bishops," said they, "affirm that only one man of learning has been deprived. But there

\* Wiburn to Bullinger, London, Feb. 25, 1567.—*Zurich Lett.* i. 187. Of the two schedules that Wiburn declares himself to have given to Bullinger no doubt one is the paper headed "The State of the Church of England as described by Percival Wiburn."—*Ib.* ii. 358. It is not an untruthful, though an unfavourable review, and worth reading. The vestiary matter is put last, along with the wafer bread of the Queen's Injunctions, and the "further order" of the Act for Uniformity.



are many who have been considered by the Bishop of London learned enough to preach at Paul's Cross : others have filled their cures with credit ; and if they lack Latin, they have Calvin and Musculus done into English to help them to expound. They say that there is but one controversy. Those who were at Lambeth on that fatal day could tell another story. They deny that women baptise ; and they say that they themselves approve not of some things in the baptismal service. These denials are untrue. They deny that the Court of Faculties belongs to the Archbishop. Yet it does. They say that this Court of Faculties is not a fiscal court. It is as much a fiscal court as ever it was. They say that they disapprove of singing boys and organs. Nevertheless they adopt them in their churches : and the metropolitan has set up an organ at his own cost in Canterbury. They speak of the freedom of Convocation, and the preponderance of the clergy there. We had a good example of that in the last synod but one, when the clergy were bidden to mind their own business." \* This letter was somewhat insolent. It inadvertently assumed, in places, that Horne and Grindal were answering for Parker. It held the ignorant notion of the Church of England beginning with the Reforma-

\* Withers and Barthlett to Bullinger and Gualter, August, 1567.—*Zurich Lett.* ii. 146. In this curious production a list of seven deprived men of learning is given : Lever, Penny, Gressop, Crowley, Gough, Philpot, Wiburn. It is scarcely an honest list, as some were deprived on other grounds than the habits, and some were not deprived of all their appointments, but of some. Lever was not deprived of Sherburn, but of a canonry, in this year, 1567. I do not find that Penny was deprived of anything at this time. He was objected to, as a preacher of one of the Spital sermons, by Parker : and, maybe, deprived of that.—Parker's *Corresp.* 264. He was deprived of a prebend ten years later, in 1577. As to what is said in this letter about the slavery of Convocation, see above, vol. v. 385, &c.

tion.\* It was disingenuous, because that, apparently answering the letter of the two bishops point by point, it omitted the calumnious accusations of which they complained: foreign tongue, oil, spittle, and the rest. Of these calumnious accusations it may be concluded that the authors were Withers and Barthlett.

Withers and Barthlett pursued their vocation by a long intercessory memorial, which they intended for the eye of Bullinger,† addressed to Frederick the Third, Elector Palatine, a Calvinian prince. They implored his mediation with the Queen of England on behalf of the Church of their country lying prostrate and on the brink of destruction, cautioning him at the same time to refer all blame to the bishops, who were her flatterers rather than her advisers. They gave him a sweeping historical sketch of the whole English Reformation, ending with their own disappointment, their woes, the danger of falling back into Lutheranism, not through the dealing of men glutted with the blood of the saints, but of men hitherto counted the best; and they set the whole conduct of things, in the settlement of religion, in a melancholy light. There was a moment, so they said, of highest hope, when King Edward was about

\* “*Primatus translatus est ad regem Henricum octavum piæ memoriæ, et omnia quæ de jure canonico ad pontificem Romanum tanquam ecclesiæ monarcham pertinebat (sic), ei data sunt: tunc ille, rex et papa, constituit alterum archiepiscopum, quippe Cantuariensem, sibi legatum, ea tamen lege ut census annuum penderet illi, quoniam et solebat legatus de latere Romano papæ.*” Again, “*Prima ecclesiæ apud nos initia, ejus progressus, variasque commutationes, controversiæ nostræ ortum, ecclesiam vero ministerio carentem, in epistola ad illustrissimum Heidelbergensem principem destinata, perspicue descripta vobis intueri licet.*”—*Zurich Lett.* ii. 89, 90.

† See last note. The “prince of Heidelberg” was the Elector Palatine. Probably they sent a copy to Bullinger, and it is that copy that is in the Zurich archives. It bears the name of Withers only: but they were both concerned in it, probably, as the plural form is used throughout.

to perfect his reformation and put the finishing touch to his Second Prayer Book: his Parliament were assembled for the purpose, when, behold, the young king died. There was another hopeful moment, at the beginning of the Queen's reign, when she established the young King's Second Book: but, behold, instead of any finishing expurgation of his Second Book, they brought back therewith the ceremonies and ornaments of his First Book, and they left the Queen and the Archbishop the power of introducing additional ceremonies at their will: in consequence of which there was wafer bread. They described how Romanensian bishops had been replaced by returned exiles for the most part, who took the office, as some of them confessed, against their conscience. They related the conduct of those bishops, imparting to them bad motives, but at the same time betraying that they knew how they were instigated; that these bishops began by promising their brethren full liberty in the government of their churches; and kept their promise for some years, whilst their brethren purged their churches with vigour: but that when others, who had shown no scruples, began in like manner, following their example, to purge their churches with vigour, these bishops grew alarmed, lest their dignity should be impaired if the inferior clergy observed not the same usages that they observed; and so took up the matter at the Queen's command: whence the strife that raged. They urged, above all, the danger of the return of Lutheranism through these bishops.\* Strange to say, this was the very thing which these bishops, on their part, apprehended through them and their Nonconformity.†

\* Withers to the Elector Palatine.—*Zurich Lett.* ii. 157.

† Grindal and Horne in their letter to Bullinger and Gualter remarked that if they all followed the Nonconformists in fighting against the laws and



These things proceeded not without some mutual confidence of the foreign luminaries: in which Bullinger, irritated and tired, expressed to Beza the opinion which he had formed both of the Nonconformist leader and of the emissaries. "Sampson," said Bullinger, "is a very restless man. When he lived with us at Zurich, and when he was gone back to England, he never ceased to pester Peter Martyr with one thing or another, always writing letters, and never a letter without a grievance. So Peter often complained. The man is never satisfied: he always has some question, some doubt. When he was here, whenever he began opening his budget before me, I used to get rid of him with civil words, for I knew his captious restlessness extremely well. England has many such, who are never satisfied, never in peace, always finding fault. I abhor men of that sort."\* The emissaries, it appears, went to him after first visiting Beza: who heard them with sympathy, but exhorted them to alleviate their evils by patience rather than by querulous accusations.† When Bullinger heard them, his dislike was not diminished. "Their minds," said he, "are entirely set against the bishops: they can scarcely say a word about them, but it savours of the bitterest scorn and the most absolute hatred. We will have no more to do with any one in this controversy, either by conference or by letter. If any other emissaries think of coming hither, they may stay away; for it will be to no purpose.‡" But Bullinger and Gualter nevertheless

giving up their livings, "papisticum profecto, vel saltem Lutherano-papisticum haberemus ministerium, aut omnino nullum."—*Zurich Lett.* vol. i. 106.

\* Bullinger to Beza, March 15, 1567.—*Ib.* ii. 152.

† Beza to Bullinger, July 29, 1567.—*Ib.* 153.

‡ "Certo ex horum sermonibus apparet animos eorum infensissimos esse episcopis, ut qui de ipsis nihil fere referant quod non sit atro sale conditum, odiumque redoleat Vatinianum." Bullinger and Gualter to

wrote to the bishops, to Grindal, Sandys, and Parkhurst, an expostulation, founded on the representations of the emissaries: that godly ministers were not only cast out of their cures, but flung into loathsome prisons, by bishops who owned that they had the better cause: that Ireland was more tolerant than England: respectfully begging the bishops to intercede with the Queen.\*

But the labours of Beza for England were more extensive than this. He wrote to Grindal, in the former year, an epistle suggesting that England and Scotland should join the Tigurine Confession, or later Confession of Helvetia, just published, and approved by the Genevan and most of the Reformed Churches.† He went through the allegations of the Nonconformists: Baal's habits, the cross in baptism, kneeling to receive, baptism by women, further order reserved to Queen by Act for Uniformity, power in hands of bishops only. In these he saw no sufficient reason for the commotion. "It seems to me a miserable thing for those who were stretching for the goal, to turn tail and make for the starting-post, putting no confidence in such leaders as they have."‡ On the other hand, he said that if some other allegations were true, that the metropolitans were bringing back such abuses as pluralities, licenses for

Beza, Aug. 3, 1567.—*Zurich Lett.* ii. 154 and 92 (Lat.). This letter runs fairly with the account that Wiburnd gave of what took place, so far as he was concerned.

\* Bullinger and Gualter to Grindal, Sandys, and Parkhurst, Aug. 26, 1567.—*Ib.* 166.

† The later Helvetian Confession was of 1566. It gained the adhesion of Scotland.

‡ "Tantum dico, si verus esset ille rumor, magnopere dolendum, videri velut ad carceres nunc se convertere, quos jam potius ad metam usque, talibus præsertim ducibus ac ministris fretos, progressos esse oportuit." 27 June, 1566.—*Epistolæ*, ed. 1573, p. 86. The want of confidence in the bishops betrayed by the Nonconformists seems to have struck their foreign advisers.

non-residence, dispensations for marriage and eating of flesh, then those who withstood such abominations were worthy of all praise. But such things seemed to him unlikely to be true.\* He had yet to learn that bishops could bring in rites and make ordinances without their presbytery. He concluded that it was wrong to desert their churches for things indifferent, though there were things indifferent which bore the reputation, and might be the occasion of superstition.† Towards the end of the year 1567 Beza, along with seventeen other Genevan ministers, followed this with a formal, but urgent epistle addressed to the brethren of England, in which he dwelt particularly upon the unconsulted presbytery, a defect which might otherwise have been known perhaps as the disused diocesan synod: which might have been remedied by patience, and which Cranmer had designed to remedy. "We have delayed offering our advice, though pressed by the prayers and groans of many. How can we doubt our brethren? How can we suspect bishops, especially such as you, of things alien from their office? How can we judge in the absence of one of the parties? Who are we,

\* They were the very things that Parker was labouring to regulate.

† "Respondeo minime mihi videri deserendas ecclesias propter vestes aut pileos, aut aliquid ejusmodi vere medium et indifferens. Sed primum omnium multa per se media, tamen propter adjunctam cultus opinionem, quæ vix, ac ne vix quidem, vitari possit, inter superstitiones, aut certe inter nimium proclives ad superstitionem occasiones, numeranda existimo."—Beza's letter *ut supra*, pp. 84, 85. Strype gives an account of this letter, *Life of Grindal*, 112. The reader may note the word *medium* thus early in this sort of connection: perhaps leading to the fallacious phrase "the via media." I may mention that the earliest example of that phrase, a phrase which I dislike very much, is in Humphrey's *Life of Jewel*, where, referring to the English Reformation under Henry and Edward, and the Marian reaction, he says, "Etsi vero, ut illi superiores non debemus esse superstitiosi, nec ut isti posteriores, furiosi, tamen esse possumus officiosi, ut media quædam via, et regia, et divina et æquabilis, teneatur."—*Præf.* 9, 10.



that we should judge at all? The presupposition of benevolent intent evoked by flagitating brethren must be fixed upon the fact of interposition, if we meddle where we cannot with charity neglect. We are asked then whether we approve of this vocation into the ministry without the lawful vote of a presbytery, without any assigned parish, after a very slight examination of life and morals. Not by the word of God, not by the purer canons. And yet better something than nothing, we know. But still we implore that a lawful vocation of ministers be vouchsafed to England; for if that be prevented, truth of doctrine will be lost. Pray the Queen, the Council, the bishops, who have by the Lord's mercy succeeded the popish bishops, for this end. What meanwhile? For ourselves we would not endure such a ministry: but we exhort those, to whom the Lord has opened this way, to persevere, and execute their ministry, so they can do it with piety and religion, hoping for better things. But if this condition be denied, they had better retire into private life. As for proceeding with their ministry, setting the will of Queen and bishops at naught, we regard that course with unspeakable abhorrence.\* As for habits, and distinguishing dress, they who have urged them have disserved the Church, and will have to answer for it at the great tribunal. But it is better for the flock to have their pastors in habits than not at all: and even if ministers are required not only to endure the habits, but to subscribe to them as right and proper, or at least give consent to them by silence, then we say that

\* "Tertium enim illud, nempe ut contra R. M. et episcoporum voluntatem ministerio suo fungantur, magis etiam exhorrescimus, propter eas causas, quæ, tacentibus etiam nobis, satis intelligi possunt."—Beza, *Ad quosdam Anglicarum Ecclesiarum Fratres super nonnullas in Ecclesiastica Politia controversias*, Epist. Eccles. 12, Oct. 24, 1567, p. 105. The observant reader will notice the phrase "Ecclesiastical Polity."

it is best to give way to violence under protest.\* So of the other ceremonies. On the other hand, with regard to excommunications and absolutions, abusedly in the hands of bishops alone, without any presbytery (and presbytery there is none in England), we advise to endure them indeed, but undergo any extremity rather than approve them, or consent to them." They concluded with a solemn and pathetic exhortation to mutual forbearance, so long as doctrinal truth remained untouched. "Bitterness on either side has vastly augmented this calamity. Obey your Queen: obey your bishops, all of you, sincerely; and avoid the occasions of Satan."† Throughout this consultation

\* At this point they address first the flocks and then the ministers: "Gregibus autem (integra manente doctrina) suademus ut doctrinam ipsam nihilominus attente audiant, sacramentis religiose utantur, suspirent ad Dominum, donec seria vitæ emendatione ab eo impetrent quod ad integram Ecclesiæ instaurationem requiritur. Sin vero ministris non tantum ut ista tolerent præcipitur, sed etiam ut ea tanquam recta vel chirographo comprobent, vel suo silentio foveant, quid aliud suadere possumus quam ut de sua innocentia testati, et omnia remedia in timore Domini experti, manifestæ violentiæ cedant."—Beza, *ut supra*, 108. Neal, who gives a very partial account of this correspondence, translates the last of this passage in the opposite sense: "Nevertheless, if ministers are commanded not only to tolerate these things, but by their subscriptions to allow them as lawful, what else can we advise them to, but that having witnessed their innocence, and tried all other means in the fear of the Lord, they should *give over their functions to open wrong*?"—*Puritans*, i. 165. Strype, who has given a translation of this letter, renders thus: "What else can we advise than that, having borne witness of their own innocence, and tried all remedies in the fear of the Lord, *to give way to manifest violence*?"—*Life of Grindal*, App. xvi. p. 40. This seems to agree with my notion that it means yielding under protest. The writers add, "Sed meliora sane quam hæc extrema Angliæ regno ominamur."

† "Hortamur in primis, et quam humillime cum lacrymis precamur optimos nostros et in Domino plurimum observandos Anglicarum Ecclesiarum fratres, ut omni animorum exacerbatione deposita (quæ sane veremur ut utrinque hoc malum vehementer auxerit) salva manente doctrinæ ipsius veritate, et sana conscientia, alii alios patienter ferant, R. M. clementissimæ et omnibus præsulibus suis ex animo obsequantur, Satanæ denique occasiones omnes tumultuum et infinitarum calami-

with the learned foreigners the discontented brethren enlarged their grievances. They brought in points that were not under controversy, and alleged scandals that existed only in imagination. They received no encouragement, but wholesome admonition, from their advisers. But it was in vain to urge upon them the doctrinal agreement between them and the Conformists. The agreement embittered the estrangement. The disappointment of concord is inverse to the distance of concord. The quarrels of brethren are flames of fire. Bitterness already ran high on either side. Upon the point of the unconsulted presbytery, or priesthood, in the vocation of ministers there is much to meditate. For the ministry the first requisite is the spiritual mind.

The Bishop of London, chief of those who were of the Nonconformists but not with them, suffered the strokes of both sides. "I confess," said he to Parker, "that I can hardly reduce things to conformity, if I deal in it alone. I will attend your meeting (of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners) on Friday: wishing that my lords of Winton. and Ely may be there."\* But no sooner was he stiffened in Lambeth than he was loosened in London. In his own churches† he was

tatum quærenti, animis in Domino concordibus, etiamsi non statim idem de quibusvis sentiant, constanter obsistant."—Beza, *ut supra*, 112.

\* Grindal to Parker, 13 Jan., 1567.—*Remains*, 291.

† "The 26 day of January next following, being Sunday, the Bishop of London coming to St. Margaret's in Old Fish Street to preach in the forenoon, the people (especially the women) that were in the said church unreverently hooted at him with many opprobrious words, and cried *Ware horns*, for that he wore a cornered cap. For the which on the Saturday next, being the 1 day of February, one woman, being the wife of one Symson, a tinker, dwelling in Southwark, was set upon two ladders, like a cucking-stool, before the same church, where she sat the space of one hour, greatly rejoicing in that her lewd behaviour, and that she was punished for the same: and likewise the beholders of the same did much rejoice therein, and animated the lewd woman to rejoice and



insulted in the beginning of the year because of the habits which he wore : towards the end of the year he was denounced in the pulpit by one of his own clergy as traitor and Antichrist. In the interval one of the most curious scenes in his episcopate had been enacted. In the terror under Mary, when the persecuted Anglicans met for the English Service in holes and corners in London, no separation from the Church of England was intended. The discontented brethren, the suspended ministers and others, only resumed the same practice now, without any design of separation as yet, without any organisation, without any new principle, unless it were that they thought Conformists as bad as Romanensians, when they began to meet secretly in divers places for the purpose of worship. They desired but to tarry in the cave until the tyranny, which with some reason they held to be exercised on them, should be overpast. They met in churches so long as they could, where friendly vicars or wardens would allow their ministers. But the churches were gradually closed to them when Grindal was forced by Parker to hold in force the regulation, which we have seen made in 1564, that none should minister in churches without a license of that or later date.\* Then they betook themselves to private houses, warehouses, ships, or lighters. They used the service which the English exiles had used in

praise the Lord for that He had made her worthy to suffer persecution for righteousness, and for the Truth's sake, as they said, and for crying out against superstition, as they termed it."—Stow's *Memoranda*, 140.

\* Grindal wrote round to the London clergy in January, 1567 (or else 1568), to permit no person to preach in their churches but such as had license from Parker or him, of date March 1, 1564, or after, "and to cause a vestry to be had in the church, and then and there to give knowledge thereof among the rest of the parishioners."—Strype's *Grindal*, 120 ; or Grindal's *Remains*, 293.

Geneva. Soon they began to gather in larger numbers, and drew the attention of the authorities. A congregation, with Richard Fitz their minister, was surprised in the middle of this year (1567), and committed to Bridewell. A month later, about a hundred such persons, having hired Plumbers' Hall for a meeting under pretence of a wedding, escaped not the vigilance of the sheriff: and, as it was ever the lay power that brought trouble on any for religion throughout the Reformation, their assembly was invaded, and near a score of them clapped into the Counter.\* An instant letter of Council required the Bishop, as one of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, to proceed upon them: and the next day he examined seven of their number. With him sat the Lord Mayor, Dean Goodman of Westminster, who was another Commissioner, his own chaplain Watts, and some other personages. Before him were convented John Smith, William Nixon, William White, James Ireland, Robert Hawkins, Thomas Bowland, and Richard Morecraft, Londoners: the pens of some of whom have described, and doubtless embellished, the colloquy which followed, in which mild authority is much browbeaten. They entered, and did obeisance. "Are all here?" said the Bishop. "No, there are ten or eleven in the Counter," was the

\* The narrative of Plumbers' Hall, by some of the Nonconformists concerned, first appeared in a book, a very rare one, entitled *Part of a Register*, which was published about 1593, at Edinburgh, and suppressed. It has been reprinted by the Parker Society in *Grindal's Remains*, 201. The title is, "The true report of our examination and conference (as near as we can call to remembrance), had the 20 day of June, Anno 1567, before the Lord Mayor, the Bishop of London, the Dean of Westminster, Master Watts, and other Commissioners." Strype (*Parker*, 242) and others follow this in saying that the case was examined before "others the Queen's Commissioners," or others of the Commissioners. But there were only two Ecclesiastical Commissioners on it, the Bishop and the Dean. The rest were not Commissioners.

answer. "I know that well enough," said the Bishop. He then rehearsed the matter of charge: that they not only absented themselves from their parish churches and other assemblies of obedient Christians in the realm, but also made assemblies and gatherings, using prayers and preachings, and ministering the Sacraments among themselves: that he desired them to leave off. Here he showed them the letter of Council, to the effect to move them by gentleness to be conformable, or else to lose the freedom of the city, and abide that which would follow. "Where is Bowland, who hired Plumbers' Hall, and told the sheriff it was for a wedding?" Bowland said that he did it to save the woman harmless who kept the hall, and at her request. "You must not lie," said the Bishop; "and herein you have put the poor woman to great blame, enough to lose her office." He continued his matter: that by their doings they condemned the whole state of the Church reformed in King Edward's days. To this, and the other matter, he would not let them answer at that point. "Have you not the Gospel truly preached," proceeded he; "the Sacraments ministered accordingly, and good order, though we differ from other churches in ceremonies, and indifferent things, which lie in the prince's power to command? How say you, Smith? You seem the ancientest; answer you." Smith began to speak, but paused. "Let me answer," said White. "Let me answer," said Nixon. "I would be glad to answer," said Hawkins. "Smith shall answer," said the Bishop. Then answered Smith, "We never assembled in houses so long as we might have the word freely preached and the Sacraments administered without the professing of idolatrous gear. But when it came to this, that for eight weeks we could hear none of our



preachers in any church, except Father Coverdale, and he was so fearful that he durst not let us know where he preached, though we sought it at his house; and then when we were troubled and commanded to your courts from day to day for not coming to our parish churches: we remembered our congregation in Queen Mary's days, and the book of the English congregation at Geneva. If you can reprove that book, or anything that we hold, by the word of God, we will yield to you, and do penance at Paul's Cross." "This is no answer," said the Bishop. "I had as lief go to Mass as to such churches," continued Smith; "the parish church where I dwell, he is a very papist who is there." "Lo," said the Dean, "Lo," said the Bishop; "he counteth King Edward's service as evil as the Mass! He knoweth one that is evil, and findeth fault with all!" Then White, "There is a great company of papists allowed to be preachers and ministers in this city, if it were well tried; and you thrust out the godly." Then another, "I know one who brought saints to Bonner in Mary's time, and now is allowed to minister, and never made recantation." The Bishop asked if they could accuse any such of false doctrine, and show him of it. "Yes, that I can," said Nixon; "and he is even now in this house. Let him answer to his doctrine that he preached upon the tenth of John." And therewith he turned and looked at Bedell, who was present. "Ye would take away the authority of the prince; and therefore ye suffer justly," said the Dean and the Bishop between them. "It lieth not in the authority of the prince, and the liberty of a Christian man, to defend papistry and idolatry, and the Pope's canon law: as we may see in the seventh of Deuteronomy. You preach Christ to be priest and prophet, but not to be king, to reign in His

Church with the sceptre of His word alone : but the Pope's canon law and the will of the prince must have the first place, and be preferred," said Hawkins. The Dean and the Bishop answered, "You speak unreverently here of the prince before the magistrates": and, "What is so preferred?" Nixon replied, "Why, that which is upon your head and upon your back! Your copes and your surplices, and your laws and ministers. You will suffer none to preach unless he wear them or subscribe to them." "What of Sampson and Lever, and others? Do not they preach?" demanded the Bishop: to whom White, "Though they preach and are suffered, yet they are deprived, and the law standeth against them." After further wrangling, the Bishop, remarking that he had never seen any who behaved themselves so unreverently before magistrates, read them a passage out of the famous letter of Bullinger to Humphrey and Sampson, without effect. "I can show you Bullinger against Bullinger in this thing," said Smith.\* "All reformed churches differ in rites and ceremonies, and we agree with all reformed churches in substance of doctrine," said the Bishop. "There is not an ordinance of Christ," answered White, "but you have mingled your own inventions withal. How say you to godfathers and godmothers in baptism?" "How say you to the church of Geneva," answered the Bishop, "which communicates with wafer cakes, which you are so much against?" "The English congregation ministered with loaf bread in Geneva," answered White. The Bishop then read a passage from the letter of Beza and his brethren to the English brethren : but without effect. They said that they had

\* The passage that Grindal read out of this letter (the letter that he had so questionably published) was, that it was "not yet proved that the habits had their origin in Rome."—*Zurich Lett.*, p. 348.

the letter at home, and it made nothing against them.\* The Lord Mayor then delivered himself at some length with much conciliation: that the Queen "had not established these garments and things" for any opinion of holiness or religion, but for a civil order and comeliness, that ministers might be known from other men. "It was by this apparel," retorted Nixon, "that the popish mass-priests were known from other men." The conversation rambled on in the same obstinate and inconclusive manner, so far as it is recorded. In the course of it the Bishop remarking, "I have said Mass: I am sorry for it," was answered, "But you go like one of the mass-priests still"; and when he proceeded, "You see me wear a cope or a surplice in Paul's: I had rather minister without these things, but for order's sake, and obedience to the prince," he was reproached by the shining example of Crowley, who "could not be persuaded to minister in those conjuring garments of popery."

At the end of this examination, all or most of them

\* The passage of Beza's letter which Grindal quoted was "*Tertium enim illud*," see above, p. 162. "That for them to exercise their office against the will of the prince and the bishops, made them tremble, the more because of reasons which were plain enough even if not uttered." The colloquy hereon was as follows: "*The Bishop*. Mark how he saith he doth tremble at your cause. *Hawkins*. Why, the place is against you: for they do tremble at the prince's case and yours, because that you, by such extremities, should drive us against our wills to that which of itself is plain enough, albeit they would not utter them." Upon this sublime interpretation, the Bishop wrung himself, and said, "See ye enter into judgment against us. *Hawkins*. Nay, we judge not: but we know the letter well enough, for we have it in our houses: it maketh nothing against us. *The Bishop*. We grant it doth not: but yet they count this apparel indifferent, and not impious and wicked in their own nature: and therefore they counsel the preachers not to give over their function or flocks for these things. *Hawkins*. But it followeth in the same letter that if they should be compelled to allow it by subscription or silence, they should give over their ministry."—Grindal's *Remains*, 209.



were sent back to prison, and this time their prison seems to have been Bridewell. And here may be noticed one of the first appearances of a bad feature in the Nonconforming party throughout their struggle: which is, never to acknowledge anything done to them in the way of kindness, courtesy, or charity, by the other side, especially by any bishop. Their own account is, "From hence to prison they went all or most part of them. Such was the great charity of the bishops! And till their day of deliverance they never knew one good word they spake for them, though divers of them had wives and children, and were but poor men."\* The truth was somewhat other. When these men had been some months in Bridewell, perhaps a year, the Bishop of London wrote to Cecil in April, 1568, recommending that they should be "simply and without condition set at liberty, saving only an earnest admonition to live in good order thereafter": that he had very certain hope that clemency would work the obedience, which compulsion could not: that if not, they might easily be committed again. The Council approved the motion, and left it to the Bishop to proceed, requiring him at the same time to admonish them that they would receive exemplary punishment if they nonconformed again.† The Bishop had them before him, read them the letter of the Council, gave them an earnest admonition to the like effect, and set them at liberty, to the number of twenty-

\* Grindal's *Remains*, 216.

† "Letting them understand, when you shall release them, that if any of them, after their enlargement, shall behave themselves factiously or disorderly, they shall not fail to receive such punishment as may be an example to others of their sort hereafter: and so with such further admonition as you shall think convenient, your lordship may deal with them as you shall see cause." Council to Grindal, April 28, 1568.—*Ib.* 317.

four.\* So may Grindal have hoped that an extremely painful and vexatious business was at an end. But it was not.

The process of separation, which was gradual, upon the part of these extreme Nonconformists, beginning with meetings in private houses, proceeded a step further in such larger assemblies as that of Plumbers' Hall, with a forbidden order of worship, including the Sacraments. But it appears not from anything that is known that any Sacrament, or any particular office, had been performed hitherto in any of their meetings or assemblies.† There were two ministers, named

\* The names of the men have been given by Strype, *Life of Grindal*, 136.

John Smith	Thos. Lydford
John Roper	Ric. Langton
Robert Hawkes ( <i>sic</i> )	Alex. Lacy
James Ireland	Jn. Leonard
Wm. Nixon	Robt. Todd
Walt. Hinckesman	Roger Hawkesworth
Thos. Bowland	Robt. Sparrow
Geo. Waddy	Rich. King
Wm. Turner	Christ. Colman
Jn. Naish	Jn. Benson
Jas. Adderton	Jn. Bolton
Wm. White	Robt. Gates.

Strype adds that there were seven women also: "Which being twenty-four, besides seven women, were accordingly discharged." So Neal: "Accordingly, twenty-four men and seven women were discharged.—*Puritans*, i. 201. On the contrary, the MS. authority for the matter (*Lansdowne*, xii. No. 28) gives the list of twenty-four men, and adds: "All these persons before written were discharged out of Bridewell, besides seven women left prisoners there, the 22nd day of April, 1569, by a warrant directed from the Right Reverend Father in God Edmund Bishop of London to the governors there." It will be observed that the list contains all those save Morecraft who were examined about the Plumbers' Hall affair, which was on June 19. As Grindal spoke of the prisoners as having been in prison a year, some must have been in for previous meetings, house meetings probably.

† So I venture to think. Grindal, it is true, said to them, in the proceedings on Plumbers' Hall, "You have gathered together and made assemblies, using prayers and preachings, yea, and ministering the Sacra-

Bonham and Crane, whom the Bishop had licensed to preach, some time before the discharge of these Nonconformist prisoners, upon their written promise "not to be present at any private assemblies of prayer or expounding of the Scriptures or ministering the Communion, in any house or other place contrary to the state of religion now by public authority established, or contrary to the laws of the realm of England: neither to inveigh against any rites or ceremonies used or received by common authority within this realm."\* This promise they had broken, and been taken and again released. At the time of the discharge of the Nonconformists they were at large; and soon after that event it was reported to the Bishop that Bonham had married a couple, and baptised a child according

ments among yourselves." But I would suggest that he was really pursuing the title of the Geneva English Service Book, which they used: which ran, "The Form of Prayers and Administration of the Sacraments used in the English Church at Geneva." They had held meetings for prayers, preaching, and fasting: but it does not appear that they had done more hitherto. But if they had, there were some ordained ministers among them, as White, Bowland, Hawkins, "all beneficed within the diocese of London."—Fuller, Bk. ix. § 2, 9. One of them, White, sent a letter to Grindal, December 19, in which he speaks of "a late exercise of prayer and fasting" with which Grindal had seemed to be offended. This letter is an interesting document, very severe on Grindal. "You said, you would never ask God mercy for using the apparel, and should appear before Him with a better conscience than we: whereas you said in a sermon, as many can witness, that you were sorry for that you knew you should offend many godly consciences by wearing this apparel, requiring your auditory to have patience for a time, for that you did but use them for a time, to the end you might the sooner abolish them: and now you displace, banish, persecute, and imprison such as will not wear nor consent thereunto. . . . Better it were for you to leave your lordly dignity, not given you by Christ, . . . than by enjoying thereof to become a persecutor of your brethren." It is signed, "Yours in the Lord to command, William White, who joineth with you in every speck of truth, but utterly detesteth whole Antichrist, head, body, and tail, never to join with you or any in the least joint thereof: nor in any ordinance of man, contrary to the word of God, by His grace unto the church."—Neal, i. 202.

\* Grindal's *Remains*, 318.



to the order of the Geneva Book. This seemed to him so audacious that he commanded Bonham to be kept a close prisoner, and inhibited Crane from preaching in his diocese. Hereupon his late released prisoners took leave to write a letter of complaint against him to the Council, as though he had played them false. "The Bishop," said they, "when he set us at liberty, declared to us in his own house, that we were free from going to our parish churches, and might hear such preachers as we liked best in the city: when we requested further that we might have our children baptised according to the Geneva Book, he said he would tolerate it, and appoint two or three to do it; and immediately after, at our request, he appointed Bonham and Crane, two preachers, under his handwriting to keep a lecture. Now he has arrested the one and silenced the other. By these means were we first driven to forsake the churches, and congregate in our houses. In coming out of prison we yielded to no condition: we were minded to stand fast by the same Gospel out of prison as in it. Help us, your honours: that our bodies and goods be no more molested." The Council sent this supplication to the Bishop, with a letter from themselves, requiring to know what he had done hitherto and what he purposed to do in the matter. The Bishop answered that he was "untruly burdened" by these men: that he had not exempted them from the laws when he released them: that he had licensed Bonham before their enlargement, not after it, as they suggested: and that he had not licensed Bonham to preach according to their fantasies, but on a written promise to obey the laws; and Crane upon a verbal promise to the like effect. In his indignation he proposed that the heads "of this unhappy faction" should be severely punished;

and that the best way would be to send "six of the most desperate of them" to the common gaol at Cambridge, and six to Oxford, and others to other gaols thereabouts.\* It may be concluded perhaps that the Bishop in his gentleness spoke to his prisoners, when he released them, in a manner that led them honestly to mistake him as to their freedom to do as they liked. As for the promptings of his indignation, doubtless transportation instead of imprisonment at home would have relieved him somewhat of a heavy charge.

I have not hitherto used the name of Puritan to designate the Nonconformists, although it has been applied to them several years earlier in their history, as if it had been their original denomination, by historians.† A beautiful and elusive term, flitting from one connotation to another, gilding an unpoetical cause with a touch of the imagination, it remains the finer essence of ages of bitter strife. It never became a denomination, the formal name of any religious body, in the great separations so soon to ensue; rather it belonged by adequacy to those Evangelics who either waited patiently in hope of changes according to their mind, or else resisted the imposed uniformity, alike without the thought of abandoning the Church. To them, to the Nonconformists proper, it was first applied: and it seems to have been heard first about the time to which we are come, and that as a term of reproach.‡

\* Grindal to the Council, Jan. 4, 1569.—*Remains*, 316; Strype's *Grindal*, 200 and 226.

† See the beginning of Chapter xxxvi. I may add that Camden puts Puritan in 1568.

‡ "About that time were many congregations of the Anabaptists in London, who called themselves Puritans or Unspotted Lambs of the Lord. They kept their church in the Minories without Aldgate. Afterward they assembled in a ship or lighter in St. Katherine's Pool; then in a chopper's house nigh Wool Quay in Thames St., where only the good-

The Bishop of London, surveying his diocese in the middle of 1568, could speak with considerable confidence of the posture of things. "The vestimentary controversy, which had cooled down for a time, broke out again last winter, by the means of certain men who are more zealous than learned or gifted with pious discretion. Some London citizens of the lowest order, conjoined with four or five ministers remarkable neither for judgment nor learning, have made an open defection from us: and sometimes in private houses, sometimes in the fields, or even in ships, have held

man of the house and the preacher, whose name was Brown (and his auditory were called the Brownings), were committed to ward: then afterward in Pudding Lane in a minister's house in a blind alley, and seven of them were committed to the Counter in the Poultry. Then after, on the 29 of February, being Shrove Tuesday, at Mountjoy Place, where the Bishop, being warned by the constables, bade let them alone. Then at Westminster the 4 of March; and in a goldsmith's house near to the Savoy the 5 of March, where being taken to the number of sixty and odd, only three were sent to the Gatehouse. In many other places were and are the like. On Easter Day at Hoxton in my Lord of London's man's house, to the number of one hundred and twenty; and on Low Sunday in a carpenter's house in Aldermanbury. It is to be noted that such as were at any time committed for such congregating, were soon delivered without punishment."—Stow's *Memoranda*, 143. These are the last of these observant notes. Stow is speaking of [1567-8] apparently. It may be observed that these so-called Anabaptists must have been the Nonconformists. We have seen that Parker suspected some of the Nonconformists, whom he examined, of Anabaptist opinions. Real Anabaptists were not unknown, and were not treated very leniently. Two of them were burned alive in Smithfield a little after this time. The Brown here mentioned cannot have been Independent Brown, who was only born about 1550. "Unspotted Lambs" is Stow's derision of the word. One of these assemblies, so mercifully dealt with, "a newly invented sect called The pure or stainless religion," met in a house to the number of 150, bringing their food with them, and distributing money in imitation of the Apostolic church, refusing to enter churches or partake of the Lord's Supper, as it was a papistical ceremony. Their preacher used half a tub for a pulpit, and was girded with a white cloth. The Council sent forty halberdiers to arrest them, who took half a dozen and let the rest go.—*Span. Cal.*, Feb. 1568, p. 7. They were ordered to conform or leave the country in twenty days (*ib.* p. 12).



their own meetings and celebrated the Sacraments. Besides this they have ordained ministers, elders, and deacons, after their own way; and have excommunicated some who withdrew themselves from their church. They consider Humphrey, Sampson, Lever, and others who have suffered so much to establish liberty in things indifferent, as semi-papists; and will not permit their followers to hear their sermons. There are about two hundred of this faction: more women than men. The Council have lately committed the heads of the faction to prison: and are labouring to put betimes a stop to this sect.\* The ministers to whom he alluded were probably White, Bowland, Benson, Hawkins, and any other already in mention, with Button and Hallingham.† It is not improbable that, if more were known of these men, divergence would be found in their views, and that they would appear distinct from such as Bonham and Crane, who soon after stood out more upon "the discipline" than on the habits. But the ordaining of "ministers, seniors, and deacons," of which the Bishop speaks, goes a good way towards "the discipline." As to excommunication, it was the extraordinary agitation of that question in the city of Calvin and Beza, which was begun years before, that put it into the heads of these early Nonconformists or Puritans, and made it prominent there. They repudiated men like Sampson and Lever; but they themselves, whatever their opinions, had no more notion than Sampson and Lever of separating from the Church. Even their inchoate scheme of discipline was to be inside the Church. The Bishop strove with them manfully and mercifully: but the mildest execution of the laws drew from them only indignant outcries. In conferring with them,

\* Grindal to Bullinger, June 11, 1568.—*Zur. Lett.* i. 201; 119 (Lat.).

† Fuller and Camden give Button and Hallingham.

though to be sure we have only their own relation, he seems not to have shone. We have seen how he fared with his Bridewell captives. There was another, a suspended minister, of wandering disposition, by name Pattenson, who, on his own showing, browbeat the Bishop famously.\*

\* Pattenson's *Talk* is an undated document, which one of the compilers of the *State Pap. Dom. of Eliz.* has suggested "about 1560": but another "probably 1567, Sept. 9" (vol. xlv., No. 20). The *Calendar* (p. 300) gives it in Sept., 1567, with the title, "Talk between the Bishop of London and Master Pattenson, who had been suspended for preaching without a cure, and had in his sermons called the Bishop a traitor and Antichrist." As it has not been printed before, I will give it. This Pattenson was favoured by the Duchess of Suffolk, and wrote and sent his story to her. "The talk between the Bishop and me after that I had been with your Grace. At my coming in to him I bade him good even. *Bishop.* Ah, master Pattenson, who licensed you to preach? *Pattenson.* Do you not know, Sir? *B.* No. *P.* I had thought you had: for I remember you gave me my letters of orders at what time by laying on of hands you made me a minister of the Church, and gave me commission to go and preach and to administer the Sacraments to the congregation. *B.* That was but in your own cure. *P.* I do no otherwise; for my cure is where-soever I do meet with a congregation that are willing to hear the word of God preached at my mouth. *B.* But you know that there is other orders by ministers, that no man may preach but in the cure that is appointed him by the laws of the realm without an examination, and so licensed by my license or the Archbishop's. *P.* Why gave you commandment that I should go preach and administer the Sacraments, which did agree with the commandment given by Christ, was a sufficient license to me, as I thought, having the testimonial under the seal of your office withal? *B.* But you know that there is an Archbishop above me, and a general commission appointed, by whose authority you were suspended the ministry, and so consequently from preaching. *P.* But the Archbishop of archbishops hath not suspended me from preaching, but continueth His commandments to me still: and besides that, I praise Him for it, He hath not decayed in me the gift of preaching, but rather increased it: and hath also given me a congregation that looketh that I should bestow it amongst them; and therefore I may not disobey Him to obey you. And as for your suspending of me, it was without any offence committed by me, but only for well doing. *B.* Yes, Sir, it was for your offence and disobedience against the prince. *P.* Why, Sir, in obeying God I do not disobey my prince. *B.* But in disobeying your prince, in this you disobey both God and the prince. *P.* That is not true. *B.* But it is true. *P.* But it is not true. *B.* I shall be believed as well as you. *P.* I think so, because you

The life of Bishop Grindal was uneasy enough at this time. When he went home, he found awaiting him an Irishman and a Scottishman and an English-

have taken on you a great authority. But for all that, when we shall both appear before the High Judge, we shall be credited according to the truth, and not according to your authority. *B.* Well, Sir, did you well, think you, to charge me in your sermons, and to send me word that I am an Antichrist, and a traitor to God and my prince, and an heretic? *P.* I think I did not ill, so long as you show yourself to be such an one: but put you away the cause, and I will cease from saying so. *B.* Why, wherein can you prove me a traitor and an Antichrist? *P.* In that you use things accursed and abominable, whereby you yourself are made abominable before God also. *B.* How prove you that? *P.* By the 7 of Deuteronomy, where it is said that not only the idols are cursed and abominable, but all that belongeth unto them, and they also that retain any of those things in their hands. *B.* Lo, Sir, you may see now how headlong you overshoot yourselves. We take not this thing from the idolaters but from Aaron. For do you not read that Aaron had a tunic appointed to him to wear, whereby he might be known, as we have our apparel? And he had a white linen ephod also to put on when he went to offer sacrifice, as we have our surplice. And how think you now how you do oversee yourselves, may not we as well use our apparel, as Aaron his apparel? *P.* Soft, Sir; you triumph before the victory. You said even now I charged you to be an Antichrist and an heretic: but methinks you will prove it, whether I will or not, for do you not know that Aaron's garments were all appointed of God to be worn, and that they have all a lively signification of Christ to come? Do you not also know that they had their end by the coming of Christ, and will you now bring Aaron's garments again in use, as though Christ were not yet come? Is not this heresy? Do ye not show yourself to be an Antichrist, when you deny Christ to be come in the flesh? *B.* Why do you then use some of Aaron's ceremonies? *P.* What be they? *B.* Kneeling at prayer. *P.* Do you compare kneeling to Aaron's garments or the Pope's attire? It was no ceremony of Aaron's. It was used before Aaron was; and it is also confirmed and had in authority in the New Testament. *B.* Well, well, I sent for you because the Duchess of Suffolk hath been a suitor to me for you, that you might be at liberty. And I am contented therewith at her request, so that you will put me in two sureties that you will not preach or minister the Sacraments any more without my license or the Bishop's of Canterbury. *P.* Her grace told me of no such sureties, neither do I mind to put in sureties to break the commandments of God. I can do that fast enough without sureties. As you do, neither mind I to make the preaching of the Gospel subject to a popish license. *B.* Will you not? Well, go to. I could keep you in prison this seven years and I list, for saying I am a traitor to God and to my prince. *P.* You know not whether you shall live seven days or not. *B.* Well,



man, who had been imposed on him for hospitality and conversation. "Milerus, the Irishman in my custody, is very sick of an ague. It would be a good thing to send him into Ireland with a pursuivant. The Bishop of Ross is a man of such quality as I like nothing at all. I would I were rid of him. With Mr. Hare I have travailed for two months to persuade him to resort to Common Prayer, to communicate with us in the Lord's Supper, and generally to assent to all points of godly religion by law established in this realm: he is very courteous, but I cannot persuade him." \* Milerus or Meyler Magrath was that Irish bishop. The Bishop of Ross, Lesley, was the well-known agent, afterwards the historian, of Mary Queen of Scots. Hare was a gentleman of coat, a stout Romanensian. To add to his troubles, the Council wrote to the Bishop urging him to suppress conventicles, to confer with sheriffs, and devise proper measures for enforcing uniformity of worship. Scarcely had they written, when an assembly of more than seventy was discovered in a house within the parish of St. Martin's in the Fields.† The Archbishop wrote to him requiring him to certify of all the beneficed men in his diocese, their age and degree; whether priest or deacon, or neither the one nor the other;

Sir, you are very cholerick; but I will cool your choler well enough. Sirrah, said he to the keeper, I hear say you let him go abroad. Go your ways, take him with you again, and let him be close prisoner, and let no man speak with him. *P.* In the name of God. And so I departed with my keeper, and then came the Bishop's yeoman of his cellar, coming after us, and desired us to drink a cup of my lord's wine in his cellar. My keeper went in with him, but I remained without, and would not go in with them, because, said I, I thought him to be accursed before God, and therefore I ought not to eat or drink in such a man's house. Thus I returned to the Gatehouse, where I am now close prisoner."

\* *Grindal's Letters*, in his *Remains*, 307, 315, 319.

† *Dom. Cal.*, p. 308: in March, 1568.

if able to preach, if licensed to preach; resident, absent; vacant livings.\* Henceforth the clergy, not of London only, were watched by informers, who made depositions to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, with the view of getting a share of the heavy fines that were imposed, particularly for non-residence.† The Queen also was upon him through his Metropolitan to enquire into the conditions of the great multitude of Strangers who were fleeing into England to escape from the cruelty of their own countries, but some of whom were “infected with dangerous opinions contrary to the faith of Christ’s Church, as Anabaptists and such other sectaries”: or might be robbers or murderers. To such the Queen declared that she meant to permit no refuge within her dominions: and bade the ordinaries of London and any other place affected to make special visitations and inquisitions in every parish.‡ A strict Visitation ensued, the third great search of the reign. But already, six months before, the Bishop had been searching. The discontent of London, his own office of Superintendent of the Strangers, alike required him to search: and he had issued a small set of exemplary Articles to be Enquired. But perhaps he had not been very active. Now that he was smitten by the Queen through Parker, he sent to Cecil a copy of his Articles, not without some sense of wrong, to prove “that the matters now complained of have heretofore from time to time been regarded.” §

\* Parker’s *Corresp.* 308. It might be noticed that this letter adds proof to the truth that the words minister and priest were interchangeable in that age. Parker writes to Grindal, “How many of all such be ministers or deacons, and how many no priests or deacons?”

† Strype’s *Parker*, i. 260; Parker’s *Corresp.* 312.

‡ The Queen to Parker; Parker to Grindal, May, 1568.—*Ib.* 321, 323; Strype’s *Parker*, i. 522, and App. lvii; Wilkins, iv. 254.

§ “Articles Enquired of in the search for the number of strangers within the city of London, and about the same, in the months of November and

They may serve to indicate the second inquisition of the reign concerning foreigners, of which they are the only monument. The third inquisition proceeded rapidly. Every house in London was visited: and in three months the Lord Mayor delivered to Secretary Cecil a certificate of all the Strangers who had arrived in London lately.\*

The immigration of outlandish persons was now grown so great as to move the just jealousy of the community of London. They raised the rent of houses in the city: they interfered with trade: they caused such irritation that at one time the Lord Mayor and Aldermen had to keep watch in the streets all night for a whole week to prevent an outbreak of the prentices upon them.† The ports and havens were crowded with them. Many came from Flanders. "People are flocking here still for refuge from the punishment which they fear from the Duchess of

December last past: viz. in Anno Domini 1567. 'They were, How many in each parish?—How long abiding?—Of what occupation, and whether suspected of ill life or any naughty religion or sect?—Whether resorting to their parish churches?—Or absenting themselves from their parish churches?'"—Strype's *Grindal*, 123. "Five days since, by order of the Queen, all the houses in this city were visited, and a memorandum taken of the people living therein, with the parish churches where they attend divine service, and what religion they profess; also in the case of foreigners how long they have been here. This has been done on previous occasions, but they say never with so much care." Guzman to Philip, Dec. 1, 1567.—*Span. Cal.* 685. It is amusing that Strype makes his bishop prompt Cecil, and urge him on. Grindal sent Cecil also a copy of the proclamation of the *first* search about strangers, of 1560; as to which see Vol. V. ch. xxxiv. Comp. Grindal's *Remains*, p. 296.

\* The Lord Mayor, Sir Rog. Martin, to Cecil, July 30, 1568.—*Dom. Cal.*, p. 313.

† "Which watch was for fear of an insurrection against the strangers which were in great number in and about the city, as in all other port towns and havens in and about the realm; and still increased, and do to this day, for the which we are bound to pray to God that some order may be taken by our prince to the contrary." Feb. 17, 1567.—Stow's *Memo-randa*, 141.



Parma," wrote the Spanish ambassador.\* Many came from France, where the persecution of the religion was at the height. They formed colonies not only in London and Southwark, but in Norwich, Colchester, Sandwich, Canterbury, Maidstone, and Southampton.† In the world's asylum they were allowed safety, peace, and liberty of conscience. The Bishop of London greatly favoured them, receiving their petitions, and requesting Cecil for their establishment and encouragement in several towns.‡ The Bishop of Winchester, Horne, favoured them, inducing the Mayor and Corporation of Southampton to admit them to reside, on condition of no corrupt religious sects or opinions maintained.§ The Bishop of Lincoln, Bullingham, favoured them, issuing breves to the clergy of his diocese for collections to be made for their relief.||

At this time the allowed churches or congregations of Strangers of several nations, in their internal affairs, and the occasional disputes and animosities of their ministers, occupied Grindal in his several capacities. Corranus, the preacher of the Spanish congregation, and Cognatus, or Cousin, the minister of the French Church, maintained a long contest. An obstinate dispute arose between Hieronymus, the preacher of the Italian congregation, and the same Corranus. Their

\* May, 1567.—*Span. Cal.* 640.

† Strype's *Annals*, i. 554.

‡ Supplication to the Queen by the foreigners driven from the Low Countries on account of their religion, to be allowed to settle and carry on their occupations in various towns in England. May 16, 1567. With letter to Cecil from Grindal.—*Dom. Cal.* 296. Some of them wanted to make glass.—*Ib.* 297.

§ *Ib.* 299.

|| Circular letter addressed to the clergy of the diocese of Lincoln, requiring them to cause collections to be made on Sundays and festival days in their parishes. With letter from Bullingham to Cecil. Feb. 1568.—*Ib.* 307.

dissensions engaged the Ecclesiastical Commissioner and his fellows, and decrees were pronounced upon them: their necessities moved the pity of the Bishop, and alms was not denied: their minutes may be neglected.\* But the dissensions of the Dutch Church in Austin Friars, whereof the Bishop was Superintendent, mixed with the distractions of England, flew abroad; occupied Beza and Geneva, affording a repeated proof that the conduct of the Nonconformists was not admired by foreign churches, and may detain the reader with advantage. The Dutch Church of Strangers quarrelled long and bitterly within itself. It was about godfathers and godmothers in Baptism, to which ordinance the Nonconformist objection was echoed by some, the congregation in general holding and practising it. The malcontents broke out of the church, revolted, departed, seceded. The ministers, elders, deacons, and the rest of the congregation applied to the Ecclesiastical Commission to bring them back, and oblige them to a reconciliation. The Ecclesiastical Commission made a decree recalling them with severe rebukes, ordaining that the church should continue under her own constitution and discipline, and exhorting all other Strangers abiding in London to communicate with that church.† It seemed good to the ministers and members, upon this composition, to strengthen themselves by defining Christian liberty and the obedience which they reasonably held to be due to governors in matters of contro-

\* Grindal's *Remains*, 309; Strype's *Grindal*, 125, 148. Corranus, or Del Corro, the Spaniard, acknowledged Grindal's kindness to them all. "Conveni hisce diebus D. Episcopum Londinensem, et pro sua erga me et alios peregrinos humanitate, singulis trimestribus aliquot coronatos mihi dandos statuit." To Parker, Jan. 1568.—*Corresp.* 340.

† This Decree was issued under the seal of the Ecclesiastical Commission, Dec. 19, 1567.—Strype's *Annals*, i. 542; Collier, vi. 443.

versy about indifferent things: and the Theological Propositions, which they framed for this purpose, they sent by certain brethren to Geneva, for the judgment of Beza and the college there, and to Zürich and other contiguous churches. They were returned with the elaborate criticism and general approbation of Berne, Lausanne, Zürich, and Heidelberg, of Geneva, and about twenty ministers there, headed by Beza. These learned wits agreed upon the whole with the Propositions or Articles of the Dutchmen concerning Christian liberty, things indifferent, and the bounds between ecclesiastical and civil jurisdiction; and acknowledged that the only stay of the controversies already begun was wholesome doctrine, once established. But they found the Propositions lacking in aphoristic perspicuity, defective, curt, hard, badly arranged, and in some points better pretermitted. They emended them, added to them, softened them, and sent them back embedded in an epistle of great length and kindly tone: but it may be questioned whether the original Articles were not more to the purpose than the softened emendation. The Dutch Church exhibited the epistle to Grindal: the delighted Bishop bade them publish the matter, with a view to the satisfaction of the scruples of his own countrymen. The Propositions, as amended by the foreign divines, save in one or two Articles in which their emendations were not accepted, with a Preface written by the Dutch ministers and elders, came forth speedily from the press of the Queen's printer Jugge; and if the mild expostulation imparted not a moment of the spirit of recollection to the rising rashness of English discontent, the tractate of Christian liberty, which may be drawn out of these propositions or aphorisms, is perhaps not unworthy of the consideration of any age.



“Christian liberty,”\* these harboured Dutch propounded, “is not a wandering and unruly license whereby we do or leave undone whatsoever we list at

\* Strype has printed these Articles in English with the title “Propositions or Articles framed for the use of the Dutch Church in London, and approved by the Church of Geneva, for putting an end to long controversies among the members of that Church: being also very profitable to be set forth in these days, wherein new congregations do spring up.” This may have been the original title, if Jugge published them in English, as is most probable. The reader may therefore easily see the Articles, as amended by Geneva, in Strype, *Grindal*, Bk. i. App. No. xviii. But the original Articles of the Dutch are less accessible. They are embedded in Beza’s *Letters*, in the letter containing the criticism (Epist. 24). I will give them in the Latin: and, as Strype has given the Genevan recensions in English, I will add in English the sum or pith of the Genevan criticism on each. The general censure is, “desiderari in quibusdam perspicuitatem quam satis intelligitis in ejusmodi aphorismis præcipue requiri. Non desunt etiam nonnulla quæ duriusculè, alia quæ nimium concisè, quædam quæ non suo loco dicta nobis quidem videantur.” The Articles are then taken one by one. *Primus Articulus. Christiana libertas non est vaga et effrenis licentia, qua quicquid lubet pro nostro arbitrio agamus aut omittamus, sed est gratuitum jus per Christi Domini mortem partum, per quod filiis Dei, h. e. credentibus, a peccati et mortis imperio exemptis, justitiæ Dei tranquille et secure vivere licet.* *Secundus. Itaque Christiana libertas, etsi in externo rerum usu minime consistit, sed res est mere spiritualis et interna, nihilominus tamen perlibenter se omni humanæ ordinationi, præpositisque Ecclesiasticis, juxta verbi Dei præscriptum submittit, anxie semper ædificationis rationem habens, et charitati per omnia, quoad licet, inserviens.* Your definition of Christian liberty is partly a causal one, partly drawn from particulars. It omits liberation from the ceremonial law, and the benefit of regeneration. The phrase *justitiæ Dei* is ambiguous: and to say that liberty consists not in external things is very obscure. We correct as follows (see Strype, Art. 1. 2). *Tertius Articulus. Quid porro ad ædificationem faciat, quid minus, id non est ex vulgi factiosorumve hominum judicio aut eventu, sed ex rei, de qua agitur, natura æstimandum.* What about things indifferent? This Article seems only about things good or bad of themselves. Read as follows (Strype, 3). *Quartus. Conscientia non est vaga opinio aut imaginatio quam quis sibi e cerebro aut ex morositate fabricat; sed est sensus et subscriptio divini judicii ex sacro Dei verbo petita; quibus fidelis quisque et quod agit et quod omittit examinat pensiculatque, deque utroque num rectum vel injustum sit, statuit.* This definition is from Calvin’s *Institutes*, and is spoiled by adding *ex sacro Dei verbo*, &c. You should have put *bona* to *conscientia*, unless you wished to say absurdly that conscience was not of nature but of grace. Correct thus (Strype, 4). *Quintus. Extra casum scandalì religionem injicere rebus*

our pleasure: it is a free gift bestowed upon us by Christ our Lord, by which the faithful begin willingly of their own accord to serve God in holiness and

*adiaphoris, est non solum earum liberum usum tollere, sed et ipsas, et quotquot iis utuntur, denique et Deum ipsum damnare. Sextus. Sine verbo Dei conscientiam prætere publicis Ecclesiæ constitutionibus, quæ apud Catholicam Dei Ecclesiam in continuo usu sunt; vel privata auctoritate aut sinistram suspicionem injiciendo, aut reprobando, easdem abrogare, plusquam insanæ temeritatis et audaciæ factum est. Septimus. Ecclesiæ constitutiones, etsi quantum ad earum formam attinet, humanæ et mutationi obnoxie sunt, ac proinde fidelium conscientias ligare non possunt, tamen quatenus fidei et charitati ancillantur, ac pro scopo habent ordinem et decorum (quæ quod Ecclesia ædificetur ac offondicula omnia aut impediuntur aut tollantur nobis observanda mandata sunt) divinæ sunt ac cælestes, et eatenus etiam conscientias sibi obstrictas habent. Octavus. Tales porro Ecclesiæ constitutiones sunt: publici Ecclesiæ congressus diebus Dominicis, ac per hebdomadem, ad præscriptas certas horas; verbi Dei e suggesto ad Ecclesiam explicatio, ante et post concionem præcatio cum Psalmodia; inter præcandum genuum flexio; in Baptismatis ministratione promissionum gratiæ Dei ac mysteriorum Baptismi juxta certam formam ad Ecclesiam declaratio: testium seu concuratorum ad pædobaptismum advocatio: Cænæ Dominicæ diebus Dominicis et mane celebratio; ad mensam in ea accubitus virorum prior seminarum posterior; destinatorum matrimoniorum in Ecclesia denuntiationes; eorundem cum doctrina et precibus inaugurationes seu confirmationes; et quæ plura his similia sunt. Here is some obscurity, and some vigour, if things be taken simple and of themselves. Here is no description of things indifferent; but an enumeration of rites of the Church which seems to confuse divine commands and ecclesiastical injunctions, and Catholic and particular: as in that about men and women at the holy table. We correct and expand these four Articles into ten, and we use *res mediæ* instead of *res indifferentes* (Strype, 5-14). Nonus Articulus. *Ecclesia Christi est cætus hominum fidelium, in quo per delectos legitime ministros Evangelii doctrina pure traditur, Sacramenta a Christo instituta legitime dispensantur, et præcepta Dei diligenter observantur.* Here the word *vocatos* is better than *delectos*. The Church may be deprived of ministry in punishment, and yet be still the Church. What you say of *præcepta Dei* is more true of the invisible than the visible Church. Read as follows (Strype, 15). Decimus. Undecimus. We approve of these (Strype, 16 and 17). Duodecimus. *Porro, si particularis aliqua Ecclesia in alia quid desideret, sive id ad doctrinam sive ad mores spectet, ac fraterne pieque conferendo ac monendo nihil proficitur, curabit tum id (salva tamen semper pace ac publicæ unitatis vinculo) primo quoque tempore referri ad concilium generale, cui ea est potestas in omnes particulares ecclesias quæ singulis**

righteousness. The man abuses the benefit of Christian liberty, and is yet sold under sin, who obeys not willingly either his magistrate or his superior in the Lord, or endeavours not to edify the conscience of his

*consistoriis in suas.* We conceive this thesis thus, to avoid calumny (Strype, 18). *Decimus tertius. Porro, quemadmodum quivis fidelis profitendo et sacramentis utendo in particulari aliqua ecclesia inseritur in Catholicam Dei Ecclesiam, ita, e diverso, quicumque aut ab eadem particulari ecclesia ob suam malitiam legitime excommunicatur, aut seipsum ob ullas causas illegitime aut cum data offensione excindit, eo ipso omnibus Catholicæ Dei Ecclesiæ privilegiis excidit, nec hanc ob causam in ullam usquam aliam particularem ecclesiam admitti poterit, donec ad meliorem animum redierit, ac pro dicta sua malitia satisfecerit.* This we entirely accept, and wish to be received by all as most orthodox. (And yet they do not enumerate it as an Article, and the Dutch and Strype omit it.) *Decimus quartus. Itaque ad evitandam fædam et perniciosam membrorum in sacro Christi Corpore lacerationem et divisionem non licet ulli, ne privato quidem homini, ulla de causa ab Ecclesia Christi secessionem facere.* That *ulla de causa* seems to us a hard saying, and likely to be open to calumny from some. So we conceive it thus (Strype, 19). *Decimus quintus. In Ecclesia Christi, quæ civitas est Dei viventis, hoc est consistorium, i. e. gubernatorum cætus ex ministris Verbi et senioribus fere constans, quod est in civitate senatus: ac proinde quemadmodum hic, id est in publicis suis functionibus, representat universam civitatem, ita et consistorium in suo munere personam et officium universæ Ecclesiæ, cui præfectum est, gerit: nec in ullam privati respectus rationem trahi potest.* We like not that exact comparison between a political senate and an ecclesiastical presbytery, or consistory, as they now call it; although you indicate rightly the limits of both. All states have not senates: all senates have not equal authority. Take it out, and read as follows (Strype, 20). *Decimus sextus. In Ecclesia Christi quicumque, sive in paucis sive in multo numero sint, sese consistorii ministris pertinaciter et tumultuose opponunt, nec obedire volunt in iis rebus quæ verbo Dei non adversantur; multo etiam magis si adversus illos insurgunt, seditionem movent, in eorum ignominiam et exitium conjurant, aut eosdem a ministerio submovent; tam abest ut se Ecclesiæ nomine ulla ratione ornare possint, ut et pro manifestis Ecclesiæ (cujus publicam pacem turbant) hostibus omnium [sententia] justissime censi ac haberi debeant.* *Decimus septimus. Est iisdem Ecclesiæ ministris sua potestas et autoritas, ut ordinationes et constitutiones condant, et ut easdem una cum aliis quæ jam olim conditæ apud Catholicam Dei Ecclesiam in usu sunt (dummodo in sacris literis fundatæ sint) si ab aliquibus damnentur, reprobentur, aut rescindantur, propugnent ac tueantur.* *Decimus octavus. Porro, quum constet Christi ministros, dum hæc faciunt, neque Christi Domini auctoritatem quicquid diminuire, neque Christianæ libertati vel tantillum derogare,*



brother. What is profitable and what is not, is not to be determined by the judgment of the common people, or of some simple man, nor yet by the issue of men's

*neque denique ullum Pharisaicum jugum fidelium cervicibus imponere; verum, e diverso, magis ac in primis curare ut sublata omni aſaſia ſalutaris de Chriſto Domini doctrina commode, decenter, cum ædificatione, ac cum fructu tradi poſſit, plane conſequens eſt ipſos hac ex occasione neque Papismi neque ullius tyrannidis inſimulari poſſe.* Gently here! avoid extremes like aristocracy, ochlocracy, and oligarchy. Read as follows, reducing these three Articles to two (Strype, 21, 22). Decimus nonus. *Eſt et eorundem Eccleſiæ miniſtrorum peculiare officium ut Dei Eccleſiam, quo illa incolumis ſit, commodis legibus et conſtitutionibus gubernent, emergentibus novis vitiis, novis conditiſ legibus, occurrant, ac, ut Eccleſiæ in vera pietate provehendæ, de neceſſariis tum Verbi tum diaconatus adminiſtrandi miniſtris proſpiciatur, fideliter curent. Item ut excommunicationem a Chriſto præſcriptam in Eccleſia in impenitentes ſtringant, idque aut tardius aut celerius, prout rei, temporis, et perſonarum rationes et circumſtantiæ poſtulare videbuntur. Nam nec de Catholica Eccleſia, nec etiam de totius multitudinis in particulari eccleſia aliqua cœtu, ſed de dictis Eccleſiæ gubernatoribus (quos Chriſtus ad exemplum Eccleſiæ Judaicæ in ſuam Eccleſiam introduxit) ſcriptum eſt Dic Eccleſiæ, &c.*

This muſt be ſoftened thus (Strype, 23). Vicesimus. They ſay that this muſt be ſoftened, and offer a ſoftened form inſtead of it. But the Dutch kept their own, and inſerted the ſoftened form after it as a ſeparate article (Strype, 24, 25). Vicesimus primus. Accepted with a ſlight addition (Strype, 26). Vicesimus ſecundus, tertius, quartus, quintus, ſextus. Accepted in general, but with ſome cautions about dangerous poſitions and openings to rebellion. Theſe the Dutch printed with theſe Articles, at the ſame time diſclaiming ſuch meaning. (Strype, 27-31, gives the whole of the Genevan remarks here.) Vicesimus ſeptimus. Accepted, with one cautious emendation in the laſt ſentence, "to ſet force againſt force," *vim vi opponere*, inſtead of "to reſiſt an unjuſt ruler," *improbo reſiſtere* (Strype, 32). The Genevan letter is addreſſed "Ad Peregrinarum in Anglia Eccleſiarum Fratres—Genevæ 25 Junii, 1568, in communi fratrum ex urbe et agro collectorum cœtu." Upon theſe laſt two or three Articles, concerning the magiſtrate, Strype gives the whole of the remarks of the Genevans, but attaches them to one Article, the 31ſt, though they were for them all. The Genevans ſtrongly objected to the mention of "tyrants" with rebels and heretics in Art. 30: but the Dutch kept the word. The Genevans objected to the poſition that a tyrannical ſuperior magiſtrate might be oppoſed by the ordinary magiſtrate. The Dutch retained this, but explained that they meant nothing ſeditious. It might be obſerved that the Nonjuror Collier is extremely indignant on this both with the Dutch and the Genevans; and launches ſome ſarcaſms of which it is not eaſy to ſee the drift.—Collier, vi. 460.

actions : but by the nature of the things in question. As, if agreeable to our calling or not : or, if otherwise indifferent, with regard to circumstances, times, places, persons, weighed in the balance of God's word. Conscience is the feeling of God's judgment, whether a man be assured thereof out of God's word, or make it to himself rashly or superstitiously : but a right conscience is that which is governed by God's word. Things indifferent by their own nature are neither good nor bad, as meat and drink ; in them therefore it is said that the kingdom of God consisteth not : but they are not called indifferent as though we might omit or use them as we list without any sin ; a man may use them well or ill. Things indifferent of themselves change their nature after a sort when by some commandment they are either commanded or forbidden. The confused use of things indifferent is restrained both generally and specially ; generally, by the universal law of charity, which forbids to do anything whereby thy neighbour is destroyed ; or to omit anything whereby he is edified ; where it is presupposed that judgment be taken out of the word of God ; and that every man have consideration of his calling, such as the Apostle intended in saying that he was made all things to all men. It is restrained specially by ecclesiastical or civil decree, whereby the magistrate, who is God's minister, for the profit of the commonwealth forbids something, otherwise lawful, to be done, or the Church, for comeliness, order, and edifying, makes laws concerning indifferent things ; these laws are altogether to be observed of the godly, and no man can without sin either do or omit contrary to them. They who either command or forbid the free use of indifferent things for any other cause than edifying, policy, or ecclesiastical order, and they who

rashly judge other men's consciences in these matters, offend heinously. Those who have been deceived by simple ignorance, or by the authority of ancient custom, are to be borne withal, as much as may be, but so far only as that Christian liberty be not generally prejudiced. There is no cause why the Church should alter this or that, being well ordained, for fear of offending some private men. Preposterous zeal and impatience overthrows the conscience of the weak: on the other hand, winking confirms weakness. It is necessary for every one to join himself to some particular Church, as it were to some certain parish in the great and wide city of God. It is not lawful for any man, for any cause, to depart out of Christ's Church, from that Church in which the doctrine is preserved on which depends the soundness of religion, and wherever the use of the Sacraments which Christ instituted is preserved. Not only heretics, but also schismatics do grievously offend. To depart out of Christ's Church is not simply to go from one company to another, but remaining in the place to separate oneself from the congregation. The Consistory, or ministers and elders, represent the Church: a man in doubt must ask their counsel, and stand to their arbitrament. No law must be altered rashly by the Consistory: nor any new law made but agreeable to God's word, profitable, and almost necessary; and then with caution and long sufferance. As to discipline, the Lord's saying, 'Tell it to the Church,' means the governors, that is, the ministers and seniors, not the whole congregation. Excommunication is the public judgment of the seniors. The civil magistrate is God's ordinance, to protect and correct the good and the bad: and whoso will not resist God's ordinance must obey the magistrate, so that it be not against the word of



God. A good magistrate is an inestimable blessing, and a bad one a scourge. The ministers of the Church, on behalf of the Church, must crave the help of the magistrate against rebels and heretics. If a tyrant be at the head, the ordinary magistrate ought to oppose him: not that we would open a window to rebellion. It is the duty of all private men, and also of inferior magistrates, rather to suffer wrong than to leave their vocation and set force to force."

In this balanced manner they laid forth their opinion, strongly inclining to uniformity. The reader will perceive that they were of Presbyterian constitution. Presbyterianism can say much for itself in theory; but in effects it has always been below expectation. About the end of 1569 there was an end of Grindal in London. With the fervent approbation of Parker he passed to the distant and elevated see of York, vacant by the death of Archbishop Young. His translation, effected with long delay, illustrated the universal law of vacancy protracted for the cause of pillage; or rather it illustrated in a case of vacancy the universal law of pillage upon the fullest use of every other opportunity, and of vacancy. There were many opportunities; and pillage as incessant as regular.

The mental eye, which beholds qualities, had long been bent in Parker on the laxity of Parkhurst; in whose see, and his own native region, resolving to hold a metropolitical visitation, he discovered a state of great neglect. The Bishop had not visited for seven years, explaining (and lamenting) that the custom of the place in visitations was septennial.\* Simony,

\* Parkhurst partly blamed the inefficiencies of Dr. Gascoyne, his former chancellor. There is a former letter from Gascoyne, "humbly offering to prove his innocency," &c., in MS. cxiv. (340) C. C. C. Cambridge, dated Dec., 1566. The names of the Commission for visiting Norwich are in *Eliz.*

bribery, and rapine were at the height in Norwich. Some gentlemen had seven or eight benefices, some four or five, fleecing them all, setting boys or serving-men to bear the names of rectors or vicars, defrauding the people of prayers and services. "Gehazi and Judas had a wonderful haunt in the country," testified the Archbishop. When his Visitors examined the cathedral church, they found that of the six prebendaries only two were preachers; that one of the prebendaries lived at Louvain, and was no priest; that another was a serving-man, not in orders, put in by Lord Keeper Bacon under a simoniacal contract; and another the like by the same:\* that three of the prebendaries never came to the cathedral church unless it were to fetch their money: that of the four archdeacons two were not resident. One man, called "Canon of the House," was a great brawler, suspected

*Dom. Pap.* vol. xlvii. 89; *Cal.* 318: they are, the Bishop, Mayor, and Chancellor, three justices of the peace, and Henry Byrde, reader of the divinity lecture.

\* Bacon resented Parker's interference in this scandalous affair. Relying on their patron these two prebendaries absented themselves from the chapter house at the Visitation. The Visitors stopped the next payment of the stipend of one of them, and this brought him up to Parker at Lambeth to demand it. He had spent his life in Bacon's service. Parker found him competent in learning, and would have had him enter holy orders, but he refused: offering however to resign his prebend to a better man, a gifted preacher, upon a pension of five pounds assured him by the church. Then it came out that he was bound to pay five pounds of his prebend to Bacon's sister's son studying at Cambridge. Archbishop Parker wrote a noble letter to Lady Bacon about the offence that Bacon had taken, Feb. 6, 1568.—*Strype's Parker*, App. No. lvi.; *Parker's Corresp.* 309. *Strype*, in his remarks on this letter (*Parker*, 249 and 258), seems certainly mistaken in making the author of the scandal to have been Bishop Parkhurst. The "my lord" of the letter is to be identified as Bacon. One of these lay prebendaries stayed contumaciously, it is true, in "my lord's" house during the Visitation: and this might be supposed to have been the Bishop's house. But that part of the country was Bacon's native place (as it was Parker's), and Bacon had a house thereabouts.

of living with another man's wife. In other matters there was better found: the fabric better upkept: the Divine service duly sung according to the Queen's Injunctions: the prebendaries all going in the apparel, saving him who was at Louvain, who was seen with a Spanish cape and a rapier before he went. The school was left wholly to the schoolmaster, with the warm concurrence of the prebendaries, who believed that it was in very good care. But the choristers were very ill ordered by the choirmaster. Some of the Articles to be Enquired in this Visitation, which were exampled for other places also, ran close to the times. As, whether any minister "persuaded any not to conform themselves to the order of religion reformed, restored, and received by public authority in the Church of England": as, for example, by maintaining that the Queen "ought not to be head or chief governor of this her people or Church of England, as well in ecclesiastical laws, causes, or matters, as in temporal": or that it is not lawful "for any particular church or province to alter the rites and ceremonies publicly used, to better edification": or "that any man may or ought by his private authority to do the same": or that any man might take the ministry upon him "without outward calling of the magistrates appointed": or by denying infant baptism, the Creed to be necessary, every Article, sin after baptism to be remissible by penance. Other Articles were against errors of another sort: maintenance of pilgrimages, relics, private Masses, trentals, purgatory, "or any other fond fantasy invented by man."\* In the same

\* Strype's *Parker*, 246, 258. Strype gives the Articles, and the Answers returned in them by Geo. Gardiner, one of the prebendaries, in the Appendix, No. liii. and liv. The Articles are also in Wilkins, iv. 257; Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* i. 303. One of Gardiner's remarks is curious: that the Holy Communion was "ministered in a chalice,



year of his Visitation the Archbishop of his own generosity founded three scholarships in Norwich, and four sermons or lectures.\*

contrary to the Advertisements of the Queen," and he desired to have the chalice "turned into a decent Communion cup." There is nothing about chalices and cups in the Advertisements. But there was on foot at this time a movement for substituting for the chalices, in which was the small quantity of wine used by the priest in the Mass, larger cups for the communicants. Gardiner also remarked that he would have "service sung more deliberately, with Psalms at the beginning and ending of service, as is appointed by the Injunctions." This refers to Injunction 49, that "in the beginning or in the end of Common Prayer, either at morning or evening, there may be sung an hymn, or such like song to the praise of Almighty God, in the best sort of melody and music that may be devised." George Gardiner was, it may be added, a noted Nonconformist, who had Articles ministered against himself at one time: and died Dean of Norwich.—Cooper's *Ath. Cant.* ii. 55.

\* Strype's *Parker*, 253. On this Norwich Visitation I may add that there are some "Instructions to the Commissioners" prefixed to the Articles to be Enquired, which have never been printed, though Mr. J. T. Tomlinson has given the first of them in his curious book (p. 74). They are as follows:—"1. That you do with all diligence travail to reduce the state of the clergy unto one uniform order in their ministration and preaching: and that without any partial respect you will put in due execution the Queen's Majesty's Ecclesiastical Laws, Statutes, Injunctions, and her Highness' other commandments given and published in that behalf. 2. Item, that in all places in your circuit you give in charge not only unto the curates and ministers, but also unto the churchwardens of every church and chapel, that they do not admit and suffer any person to preach or minister in their several church or chapel before they shall first see their several licenses under seal in due form, under the pain that may follow thereof. 3. Item, you shall take diligent heed that no fees but due and of old accustomed to be exacted or taken of any of the people by any register, clerk, sumner, or any other your ministers or attendants. 4. Item, for the better certainty and knowledge of all duties and fees unto such as should pay the same, you shall note the certain sum thereof with one of your hands at the least in some part of every instrument or writing that shall pass your seal or grant. 5. Item, that you foresee that no greater price be taken for the Articles, which you shall enquire of, together bound with the Advertisements, than *ivd.*, and for the Table of the degrees *iid.* 6. Item, when you have finished your Visitation and circuit (the charges of your voyage being borne and discharged) if any part of the due procurations by you received of the clergy do remain unspent, all the same you shall distribute to the most poor and needy of the clergy that be residents and keep hospitality upon

Traces of this metropolitical Visitation may be found in other dioceses. In Bangor the excellent new Bishop Robinson assured the Archbishop that the Commissioner, whom he had sent, had done much good in short time: sent a list of his clergy; that he had but two preachers in his diocese, though there were some who could preach but had not taken licenses: that there were some holding ecclesiastical preferments who were not deacons or priests, to the utter decay of learned men to be ministers when men that were no ministers had livings. The Bishop of Peterborough, Scambler, reported that two vicars in his diocese had been put in the stocks by their parishioners, and otherwise ill-treated, in contempt of their ministry, rather than for any just cause: complaining also that some ministers of his diocese had been maliciously brought up before the Ecclesiastical Commissioners by their enemies, to their heavy charges and vexation: and requesting that one minister who had been fetched up before the Archbishop's Court of Audience, out of malice, to put him to charges, might be remitted to him, the Bishop of the diocese.\* It is likely enough

their benefices in the said diocese."—Brit. Mus. T. 1015 (1). Hence it appears that Parker sent round the Advertisements and his Tables of prohibited Degrees in Matrimony along with his Articles of Visitation. It is an interesting instance of the actual use of the Advertisement, but noways helps to prove that they were Elizabeth's "further order." It may be further observed that Parkhurst himself visited his own cathedral church this year, and his Articles remain. One of them is, "Whether ye know of any sectaries that use to make any private conventicles in private men's houses in contempt of the laws and good orders set forth by authority, and do preach, teach, or minister the Sacraments there; and by that means attempt to withdraw the people from due obedience, and to raise and maintain schisms and sects: who they are that so do; where they do it; and what be the articles and contents of their doctrine and opinions."—Printed in the Appendix to *Second Report of Ritual Commission*, p. 405.

\* Strype's *Parker*, 256: from MS. cxiv. C. C. C. Cambridge.

that by spies and informers business was made for the spiritual courts: that some were vexatiously cited, and underwent great annoyance. The pursuivant or messenger of the court was paid by the mile; fees were heavy, proceedings were dilatory, and the victim of malignity might find himself at last exhausted with attendance, half ruined by costs, and still bound by recognisances to appear again at call.\* But it must not be supposed that all commissional cases went to Lambeth. The Ecclesiastical Commission was erected in other places.† The diocese of Winchester was reached by Parker's Visitation somewhat later, in 1569, when different Articles to be Enquired were applied, from which it appeared that the deceptive intrusion of mere laymen into the ministry demanded watchfulness, and it was not unknown for some to take the diaconate, so to gain admission into churches, and "usurp the office of the minister" or priest.‡ To the same year belongs the Archbishop's ordinary Visitation of his own diocese: the Articles remain, and are partitioned to such enormities. The same enquiry is repeated in the same words concerning unordained intruders into the ministry: and on the other hand it is asked whether there be any "over priest or minister" who

\* Such is the melancholy picture drawn by Neal.—*Puritans*, i. 209.

† There were Ecclesiastical Commissioners for the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield appointed in 1568 (*Dom. Cal.*, p. 310); and for Chester in the same year (*Ib.* 322).

‡ "Whether any have intruded themselves, and presume to exercise any kind of ministry in the Church of God without imposition of hands and lawful calling by ordinary authority; and whether any admitted but to the deaconry usurp the office of the minister." This is found in "Articles to be Enquired of within the Diocese of Winchester in the Metropolitcal Visitation of the Most Reverend Father in Christ Matthew Archbishop of Canterbury, London. By John Day."—Lathbury's *Hist. of the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 78. Unfortunately Mr. Lathbury has not said where a copy of Day's publication is to be seen, and gives no more of it.



has ceased to minister, to resort to the Common Prayer, or to communicate, and now "goes and boasts himself like a layman." It is also enquired whether there be any, laymen, or children, or any under age, in the enjoyment of benefices: and any patrons keeping benefices vacant and conveying the tithes and other fruits to themselves.\*

These efforts of Visitation partly anticipated, partly followed a peal of thunder from the Queen and Council on the slackness of bishops, a pure and spontaneous sentiment which not in that age only has arisen in the mind of the laity. "In conference with us," said the Council to Parker and the bishops; "the Queen is moved to think that the diligence of bishops, prelates,

\* These "Articles to be Enquired of within the diocese of Canterbury in the ordinary Visitation" of the Archbishop are worthy of study. They gave the model of Grindal's Articles for the same diocese in 1576. They twice mention the Advertisements in company with the "Queen's Majesty's Injunctions," and the "Queen's Majesty's Injunctions and Homilies"; but they avoid calling them the Queen's Majesty's Advertisements. They are "the Advertisements set forth by public authority" (see above on this). These Articles bear the strong impress of Parker. They curiously enquire whether the Holy Communion were ministered "in any profane cups, bowls, dishes, or chalices heretofore used at Mass, or else in a decent Communion cup": whether wafer bread were used according to the Queen's Injunctions, or common bread: whether altars were taken down, "according to the commandment in that behalf given," referring probably to the Queen's Injunction "that no altar be taken down but by oversight of the curate of the church and the churchwardens": whether communicants received standing, sitting, or else kneeling: whether notorious sinners or malicious persons were admitted to Communion "out of charity, without just penance done and reconciliation made": whether there were any that heard or said private Mass; or openly or privily used any kind of service or common prayer other than was set forth by the laws of the realm: any that kept "secret conventicles, preachings, lectures, or readings, contrary to the laws": any that maintained erroneous opinions, "contrary to the laws of Almighty God and good religion by public authority in this realm set forth": any that refused "to conform themselves to unity and good religion": or that spread rumours "of the alteration of the same."—Wilkins, iv. 257; Cardwell, i. 355.

and pastors of the Church of England is of late years diminished, so that no small number of her subjects, through lack of teaching, correction, and reformation, are entered either into dangerous errors, or a life of contempt without use of the rites of the Church, openly forbearing to resort to their parish churches for common prayer, hearing of sermons, and consequently receiving the holy sacraments. We find a concurrence of causes of these disorders, but none greater or more manifest than the universal negligence (for less we cannot term it) of the bishops of the realm. They have peculiar possessions to maintain officers: they have jurisdiction over inferior ministers; by them to enquire of such contempts, and reform them by teaching and correction; and to make a due information of the incorrigible to her Majesty as the Supreme Governor under God of the whole realm. Some bishops are more to be commended than others for teaching, preaching, and visiting: but no bishopric is free from this infection. We therefore notify all alike of her Majesty's care and desire to have her realms reformed: and seek to know the state of every diocese in the points hereafter following."

The points are, what persons resort not to their parish churches, or communicate: and how long they have forborne? what ecclesiastical officers there are? what preachers are there in the bishop's household, what preachers in his diocese abroad? the number of prebendaries, canons, and preachers: whether resident: what vacant places, and so on.\* The answers that were returned from the dioceses were arranged in

\* Council to Parker, Nov. 6, 1569.—Strype's *Parker*, 282; Wilkins, iv. 256; Parker's *Corresp.* 355. This letter of Council has a postscript about "the recusants to come to church," which is, I think, the earliest mention of that word in this connection. Parker wrote to Cecil with some bitterness about the tone of this letter.—*Corresp.* 362.

exact accordance with these demands. The answers returned from Canterbury and Chichester remain.\*

\* These returns, hitherto unused, are in vol. lx. No. 71, *Eliz. Dom.* in the Record Office (*Cal.*, p. 357). They consist of twelve paper sheets, written on one side only, enclosed in parchment covers. *The first sheet* is as follows: "Archiep. Cantuar. Habet in privatis ædibus communiter tres aut quatuor sacellanos concionatores et studiosos alios. Tum habet hos, D. Porye, Iguldum, M. Matchet concionatores. Et hos, D. Coldwell, M. Joscelin, M. Grome, M. Staller studiosos." That he has other preachers scattered through his diocese and his peculiars, the first-fruits of which he pays for the more part. That he has daily prayers, quarterly Communion, and frequent sermons in his chapel: "ad quas non veniunt Dr. Thirlby, Dr. Boxall, nec servi eorum ad communionem." That he has preachers throughout his province, admitted by commendatory letters from other bishops, or examined by himself in preaching in his private chapel or in Lambeth Church, and made to sign some articles of religion. This paragraph is endorsed, "Jam 250 a primo Martii in anno 1564 ad hunc diem." That he has officers in his courts. *The second sheet* is a summary of Canterbury Cathedral and officials of the diocese under several points or headings, as Nomen, Gradus, Beneficia, Valor, Ubi residet, Quoties et ubi prædicavit a festo Michael, 1568. An hospitalis, An in fructibus. The number of sermons runs from one to thirty-five: among the Six Preachers from thirty-eight to fifty-eight. *The third and fourth sheet* gives the visitation of the diocese under deaneries, and various points or headings: viz. Ecclesiæ, predicator, Ecclesiæ vacantes, Proprietarii, Patroni, An plebs veniant ad preces (*raro* is constant), An communicant, Quot familiæ, Quot communicantes, Confirmatio puerorum hoc anno. The particulars are interesting. Under An communicant, Canterbury Deanery has nomina per annum 16: Westbere, 4: Bridge, 25: Charing, 13: Lympne, 2: Sutton, 6: Sittingborne, 20: Ospringe, 4: Sandwich, 11: Dover, 2: Eleham, 9. Under Quot familiæ, and Quot communicantes, C. has 1,218 and 3,431: W. 855 and 2,805: B. 1,411 and 4,411: Ch. 2,402 and 8,952: L. 1,279 and 3,967: S. 1,712 and 6,035: Sitt. 877 and 3,108: O. 947 and 3,140: Sand. 770 and 2,742: D. 717 and 1,971: E. 632 and 2,235. (Strype, it may be noticed, gives another paper, returning a somewhat smaller number both of families and communicants.—*Parker*, 285.) Under confirmatio the masculi much exceed the feminæ everywhere. C. has 47 and 34: W. 26 and 18: B. 102, 48: Ch. 281, 210: L. 63, 55: S. 182, 147: Sitt. no return: O. 137, 109: Sand. 95, 46: D. 13, 1: E. 22, 19. At the bottom is a note of those who had not communicated, "aliqui eorum per decem annos, et aliqui eorum sunt excommunicati." One had been under sentence of excommunication for two years. *The fifth sheet* gives the particulars of the deaneries of Arches, Croydon, and Shoreham under the same points or headings. It mentions delinquents by name: *e.g.* Jn. Conias, mercator, had not communicated for three years "quia papista." Mr. Clark of



They are full of interest, enabling us, among other things, to compute how nearly the Church was then the nation.

St. Vedast not for two years "quia puritanus": and so of others. *The sixth sheet* is about the Court of Faculties. *The seventh* gives particulars concerning the Strangers in Sandwich, Maidstone, Norwich, and Lynn. *The eighth* is a list of preachers approved since 1 March, 1564. In all there are 252 preachers. *The ninth* is of Chichester, *sede vacante*, under the same headings, name, degree, benefice, &c. *The tenth* is in English, "Disorders in the Diocese of Chichester contrary to the Q. M. Injunctions." It seems to be founded on the depositions of licensed preachers, and is valuable. In some parishes there had not been a sermon for twelve years: in some not for seven. So the parishes declared to the preachers who went thither to preach. In one parish there was "a very fair church, and therein neither parson, vicar, nor curate, but a sorry reader": and the parsonage was farmed by a gentleman, it was thought from the Earl of Leicester. In the Deanery of Midhurst a list of six beneficed men is given, "which did preach in Q. Mary's days, but now do not nor will not, and yet keep their livings." Three others are given that were "fostered in gentlemen's houses, and run between Sussex and Hampshire, and are hinderers of true religion, and do not minister." Several ladies and gentlemen are returned who "come not at their parish churches nor receive the Holy Communion at Easter, but at that time get them out of the country until that Feast be past, and return not again until then." The Pooles, Gunters, and Leeds were among them. In Paxton parish they were with the first to receive the books made beyond the seas: "for exhibition goeth out of that shire and diocese unto them beyond the seas, as to Mr. Stapleton, who being excommunicated by the Bishop, did fly and avoid the realm; and these men have his goods and send him money from hence, Wm. Ryman of Oving, Mr. Dolman, Wm. Daves of Patching, Sir Davy Spencer: and to these doth this Stapleton send his letters." In Arundel church there were certain altars standing. In many places there were "images hidden up and other popish ornaments ready to set up the Mass again in twenty-four hours' warning." In some places where the rood was taken away "they painted in the place a rood with chalk," and when that was washed away, "with painting." It appears also that crosses at graves had been removed, though there was no authority for that, and this had provoked to retaliation. "The number of crosses standing at graves in the churchyards taken away also, since they have made crosses upon the church walls within and without, and upon the pulpit, and upon the common table, in despite of the preachers: and this was done of very late in Patching since I preached last there." In many places they kept their chalices, "looking for to have Mass again," though they had been ordered to turn them into Communion cups, keeping

The Universities, or some of their colleges, drew the attention of the Archbishop, or even of the Ecclesiastical Commission in those years. The old religion

weight for weight, not to charge the parish with the buying of one altogether new. In some parishes they feigned that their chalices had been stolen, "and therefore they ministered in glasses and profane goblets." There were schoolmasters who were "not of a sound and good religion." Many gentlemen received the Communion at Easter in their chapels at home: "and then they chose them each a priest for the purpose to minister unto them there, fetched a good way off, and do not take their own minister of their parish church, nor receive not three times in the year in their own parish churches, as by the law they should do, and therefore there is some suspicion of false packing amongst them in the ministering of the Communion." One minister had been fetched ten miles to minister out of his own church without license of his ordinary. Sir Edw. Gates's chapel was of this fashion. In most places the ministers did not read "the Declaration of certain principal Articles of Religion set forth for the testimony of unity in doctrine and appointed to be read twice in the year": i.e. the present Articles. "They had not, nor knew of the same: nor yet had the Advertisements nor the Table touching the degrees of matrimony." In the city of Chichester "few of the aldermen be of a good religion, but are vehemently suspected to favour the Pope's doctrine, and yet they be justices of peace." In the town of Battle they alleged a privilege from William the Conqueror, "so that no ordinary hath to do among them." When a preacher went there to preach against the Pope's doctrine, "they will not abide, but get them out of the church," as several preachers could witness: "and the schoolmaster is the cause of their flying out, who afterwards in corners among the people doth gainsay the preachers." Indeed Battle was "the popish town in all Sussex." *The eleventh sheet* continues the same. In many parishes there was ringing between morning prayer and the Litany, and all night after All Saints' Day, "as before, in time of blind ignorance and superstition taught by the Pope's clergy." In some parishes they had Sanders's book entitled *The Rock of the Church*, in which "he doth not account the bishops that now be to be any bishops at all": and they had not delivered it to the ordinary, according to the Queen's Proclamation. There was one Father Moses, sometime a friar, in Chichester, who went about from one gentleman's house to another with news and letters, bearing a popish Latin Primer about him, "and in certain houses he maintaineth the popish purgatory, and the praying to dead saints." Many in the diocese brought their old Latin Primers with them to church, "and use to pray upon them all the time when the Lessons be a reading, and in the time of the Litany." Some old folk had beads in the churches. In some places the rood-lofts were still standing: in some churchyards the timber of those that had been taken down was lying still

lurked in Oxford. In All Souls a mandate to melt down the old plate that was of "superstitious fashion" remaining unheeded, some of the fellows were summoned to Lambeth, and returned with strict orders to break and deface the plate in the presence of the whole fellowship. They were also compelled to send to Lambeth, "as derogatory to the state of religion publicly received," a collection of old service books which they still retained; missals, grailes, antiphoners, portuises.\* In Corpus Christi the new President Cole, a returned exile nominated by the Queen, was refused admission, and Harrison, a Romanensian, was elected by the college. Horne, the Bishop of Winchester, the Visitor of the college, placed Cole in the presidentship by force, breaking open the gates, which were closed against him: but the business went beyond Horne unaided; it was settled by a Commission by the expulsion of three of the fellows: upon which Commission, it may be remarked, sat Humphrey,

untouched, ready to be set up again. *The twelfth sheet* is a certificate for armour. There remain also some returns from the dioceses of St. David's and Llandaff.—*Dom. Cal.* 362.

\* The letters about All Souls are in Gutch's *Collect. Curiosa*, ii. 279; Nichols' *Royal Progresses*, i. 247; and Parker's *Correspondence*, 297. The list of books of the old religion seems a long one: but some were of Mary's date.

Three Mass books, old and new: and two portuises.

Eight grailes: seven antiphoners, of parchment and bound.

Ten processional, old and new.

Two hymnals.

An old manual, of paper.

An invitatory book.

Two psalters; and one covered with skin.

A great pricksong book of parchment.

Another of vellum covered with hartskin.

Five others of paper bound in parchment.

The founder's Mass book in parchment, bound in board.

An antiphoner and a legend.

A portuise in two volumes, a manual, a Mass book, and a processional.



the late Nonconformist. In New College there were many Romanensians: the same Visitor found his strength exceeded the second time by the taste of purgation; and, again appealing to Parker and the Ecclesiastical Commission, received again the aid of a Commission.\* In Merton College the young men of the house, given to sloth and pleasure, were reluctant to take Holy Orders, although the Founder had decreed that three of them at least should be in the priesthood: and when the Archbishop insisted that the three senior fellows should comply or quit their fellowships, they made interest with the Attorney-General, Sir Gilbert Gerrard, to induce the Archbishop rather to dispense with the regulation. The Archbishop stood his ground, telling the lawyer, not without a tinge of patient humour, that if there were no preachers to instruct the people in their duties, Westminster Hall might come to an end. But it cost him much labour to reduce that proud fraternity.† All these visitations and enquiries were, however, little to the Archbishop's mind. Many of them were the work of the detestable activity of informers: particularly such as had a penny in them; such as old plate and ornaments. "There may be roaring and rooking in the realm by new devised visitations," said he to Cecil, "but I fear it will be nothing beyond disquiet." There was an information laid against Dean Goodwin of Canterbury, that he had sold and

\* In 1568.—Strype's *Parker*, 266.

† In 1567 and 1568.—Strype's *Parker*, 251; Strype's *Grindal*, 133. "I marvel much that the fellows of Merton College should be so much grieved with one order we made for three only priests to be within the college: whereto they be all sworn by statute: and amongst the number of twenty of them that not three are disposed to serve the realm in that holy ministry, but would in idle pleasures wear out their lives. I cannot of conscience favour them therein," &c. Parker to Gerrard.—*Corresp.* 326.

divided plate and ornaments to the worth of a thousand pounds. On enquiry it was found to be under a fourth of that sum, not one penny divided, but with consent of the whole chapter kept in one stock for church use only. "I think the spirit of Pope Hildebrand is walking furiously abroad to slander the poor married estate," said the Archbishop. "There were dividends of plate and copes in Doctor Wotton's time; Doctor Wotton had his portion; there were remainders of his dividend in his house. At my coming there was not a tenth of the plate and ornaments that were in the church at Doctor Wotton's coming. I would it were indifferently credited whether the married sort or the virginal pastors have done most spoil in the church: though fault have been in both."\*

In Cambridge the disorders of the Puritan part were little abated. An order from the Queen insisting on the use of the Latin version of the Prayer Book in the chapels caused riot in the chapels, the students walking out with cries of the Pope's dregs.† Some of the professors refused to read their lectures.‡ When Parker ordered an enquiry, the Vice-chancellor challenged the authority of the Ecclesiastical Commission within the University.§ When Parker summoned one of the principal disturbers to appear at Lambeth, the Vice-chancellor forbade him to go. When Parker ordered a search for suspected books in one of the colleges, the Vice-chancellor withstood the search, and dismissed the searchers: then ordered a search of his own device, unsealing the door of the college, which Parker had caused to be sealed. Parker marvelled

\* To Cecil, Aug. 1567.—*Corresp.* 303.

† Strype's *Parker*, 269.

‡ *State Pap., Dom. Cal.* 304.

§ Young, Vice-chancellor of Cambridge, to the Chancellor Cecil, objecting to the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Commission. Jan. 1569.—*Dom. Cal.* 328.

thereat, considering that in former years, from first to last, the Ecclesiastical Commission had done good service, dislodging as many as forty papists out of the colleges.\* To them perchance he reckoned now the consistent Romanensian, Philip Baker, Provost of King's College, who had already been deprived of a London living rather than subscribe a declaration required by the Bishop of London; who had neglected a former Visitation by which he was enjoined to destroy the copes, vestments, crosses, candlesticks, and old service books which he kept "buried in a corner above ground against another day":† who was reported a great favourer of Romanensians, even giving money to Louvainists; who would neither preach nor dispute, commonly flying to town to avoid his turns; who said in private that he would not alter his religion for ten provostships; and who was, according to his enemies, corrupt, greedy, extravagant, and lazy. Upon him and his college a new commission was now opened, promoted by some of the fellows, ordered by Grindal and Cecil. The Provost fled to Louvain, and was formally deprived in his absence. As a proof of his integrity, he gave up all

\* Strype's *Parker*, 267; *Parker's Corresp.* 343.

† Strype's *Grindal*, 142; *Grindal's Remains*, 308; *Cooper's Athenæ Cantab.* ii. 322. The troubles of Baker began in 1565, when some of the fellows of King's exhibited articles against him to their Visitor, the Bishop of Lincoln; one of which was about books and vestments. The Bishop gave him some injunctions, which he disregarded. In 1569 the fellows again complained of him, to Grindal and Cecil, and eight of them brought fresh articles against him in November. In one of them it was charged that he kept "a great heap of popish pelf, as Mass books, legends, couchers, and grails, copes, vestments, candlesticks, crosses, pixes and paxes, and the brazen rood itself"; and that "to the end that the said popish trash might remain safe and untouched, to serve for a day," he kept the key of the vestry where they were in his own hands, though by statute one of the fellows ought to have kept it. He was deprived in February, 1570.



the money and plate, and carefully sent back the horses of the college, which had carried him to the sea-side. The same autumn, of 1569, witnessed the stormy resignation or expulsion of the remarkable Master of St. John's. Between Longworth and Fulk the disputes and animosity revived, if they had ever subsided, and grew to such scandal that the Bishop of Ely determined on a Visitation of the college, and fixed his citation on the door of the chapel. The Master pulled it down contumaciously. The Visitation, however, went on, and the Master resigned to prevent expulsion. Then, denying that his resignation had been free, he was expelled; while Fulk resigned his fellowship. But Fulk was quickly restored, and disputed with Kelk the vacant mastership. Factions again ran high, but were laid by the advice of Cecil and the election of the moderate fellow Shepherd, in whom the Muses hailed the guardian of a distracted flock, the Camillus of a shaken commonwealth.\* So proceeded the diversity of religions in the Universities. Other learned fraternities were not unaffected, and the Inns of Court held students who under suspicion of Popery were strictly interrogated at this time before Parker and other of the Commissioners, sitting in the Star Chamber. Some of the Temple were committed to the Fleet.†

Some of these students of the law were examined concerning their presence at the Mass, which was said

\* December 31, 1569. —Cooper's *Ath. Cantab.* i. 399; Strype's *Grindal*, 152.

† Strype's *Parker*, 287; Collier, vi. 475; Strype's *Grindal*, 137, 152. Grindal was the chief mover in this. It was in 1569. Some of them pleaded that they went to the Temple Church on Sundays and holidays; but the invagation of this answer brought out that they only went into the building, "and walked about the roundel there."—Strype, *Annals*, i. 607.

to be celebrated in the Temple, in White Friars, and in the Spital. The struggle of the religions was notable in these years. A rumour was spread in France that the Mass was again said publicly in London without hindrance.\* The coining of strange rumours was imputed, not without probability, to the hopes of the Romanensians, which were still high. A place in the vast structure of St. Paul's, known as Papist Corner and Liar's Bench, the resort of the more noted walkers in the church, was said to be the mint of the most amazing rumours: and thither came one day the Bishop of Ross, the active agent of Mary of Scotland, in a gown of damask with a great muster or rout of men attending on him, as Bishop Grindal was informed.† Nevertheless, there was this much of truth in such rumour, that the Queen knew of the concourse of English people to the Mass allowed to the Spanish ambassador, without prohibiting it. Don Guzman had his doors open in time of service, and all nations came, English among the rest. This went so far, that the Ecclesiastical Commission, Grindal, Cave, Haddon, and others, summoned about thirty persons,

\* "It is reported that in England Mass is being said publicly and is numerously attended: that the priest who was divinely inspired to celebrate Mass in public not being impeded, many other priests have followed his example without hindrance." So the Venetian ambassador in Paris wrote home at the beginning of 1567. A month later he contradicted the report; which was so generally current, that the English ambassador, Norris, had taken pains to find it untrue.—*Ven. Cal.* 387, 388.

† "The Bishop of Ross mustered this day in Paul's Church, in a gown of damask, with a great rout about him and attending upon him, as it were to be seen and known to the world." So an unknown correspondent wrote to Grindal, who again wrote it to Cecil, 22 Oct. 1569.—*Strype's Grindal*, 150; *Grindal's Remains*, 315. This letter of Grindal's has also been printed by Wright, who reads "ministered" for "mustered."—*Elizabeth and her Times*, i. 330. The original is manuscript.—*Lansdown*, xi. f. 152. "Mustered" is right. The curious passage about Papist Corner is from Thomas Norton's *Warning against the dangerous practices of the Papists* (1570); see it in Wright, i. 346.

examined them on oath, and imprisoned several. A larger number than those who were summoned accompanied them to their examination.\* The house of the Portuguese ambassador in Hoxton was another hospital of the illicit religion, which was watched by the Commissioners.† On the other hand it caused grief to the Romanensians that the new Imperial ambassador, Count Stolberg, should be a Lutheran, who went to the Dutch Church, and heard the sermon there.‡ The matter of services, the contest between

\* The recital of this case in the Spanish ambassador's letters opens an interesting view of the way in which things were carried on. The persons summoned before the Commissioners were asked to take oath (the Oath *ex officio*) that they would answer truly the question put to them. About twenty of them took it "conditionally, to answer according to the law." Six refused, and were sent to prison; five were kept there some time. Those who took the oath seem to have been let off. Guzman had a conversation with Cecil about this, and promised in future to close his chapel doors against Englishmen. He had observed that there was no prohibition from the Queen, and had been going on rather freely. Dec. 1567.—*Span. Cal.* 686, 689, 690.

† Grindal, hearing of the resort of English men and women to Mass there, gave a warrant to the constable to apprehend any who should be suspected to come from the service, but not authorising him to enter the house; but he did. Afterwards the ambassador kept all English inside at the end of the Mass, and denied that there were any there. Grindal to Cecil, Oct. 1568.—*Remains*, 300. The depositions of the constables are in the Record Office. Two constables got into the chapel on Sunday morning in the middle of Mass, and seeing about eight English persons there commanded them in the Queen's name to come out; at this bungling interruption the Portuguese seized their weapons, their partisans, pikes, guns, and dags, so that the constables trembled. The ambassador furiously demanded to see their warrants; they showed him their commission with Grindal's name appended. "You dogs of villains," cried he, "do you think I care for the hand of the Bishop of London, if the Queen's hand is not at it?" And he thrust them out at the gates.—*MSS. Dom. Eliz.* xlviii. 26 (2); *Cal.* 321. Lisbon was perhaps the most important seaport in the world at that time.

‡ "The Count did one thing he had better have left undone, to go to the church which the Flemish heretics have here, and hear the sermon: whereat they and the other heretics have greatly rejoiced, and the Catholics grieved."—Guzman de Silva to Philip, June, 1567.—*Span. Cal.* 645.



the Mass and the Communion, reached a fine point among ambassadors at this time. The Earl of Sussex, proceeding to the Imperial Court in the summer of 1567, took with him the Latin version of Elizabeth's Prayer Book: he also took with him unwittingly a spy, who informed Guzman, who informed King Philip, of the fact.\* Sussex's mission was caused by the suit of the Archduke Charles to Elizabeth: in the negotiations the religious question arose: the son of the Emperor was willing to have accepted a mere toleration, to have exercised his religion secretly in his chamber, and to have accompanied the Queen at all times publicly to her divine services.† This condescension stood in contrast with the vigorous strictness of the Spanish Court: for Elizabeth heard with indignation that her ambassador at Madrid, Doctor Mann of Cambridge, had been forbidden to use in his own house privately the English Service, and that all his household, except himself, had been compelled to go to Mass.‡ The English ambassador in Scotland refused to be present at the baptism of James, the infant son of Mary Queen of Scots, at which the rites of the Roman Church were observed in full magnificence.§ The dejection of the cross in the

\* The spy was named Pole, and was in the household of De Feria, the former Spanish ambassador.—*Span. Cal.* 653.

† Strype, *Annals*, i. 535. The Venetian ambassador with the Emperor wrote home that the Queen would allow the Archduke at first to have a private chapel in the palace, but by no means a public chapel, still less a public church with music, choristers, organs, and other solemnities, such as he would wish. She said that the kingdom would not concede this to herself, much less she to him. In time he might get something better. January, 1568.—*Ven. Cal.* 410.

‡ Epistola Jo. Mann dat. Madrid, 4 Nov. 1566, "quod impetraverat immunitatem religionis et securitatem ab omnibus molestiis, sed sibi soli; famulis suis negabatur."—Nasmith's *Cat. of C. C. C. Camb. MSS.* p. 161.

§ The English ambassador, however, procured a proxy. The baptism was at the end of 1566. Queen Elizabeth sent her future successor the great

Queen's chapel, which happened about this time, might have been a struggle of religions at home, if it had not been the work of a madman. Don Guzman would fain have enhanced it. "See the insolence of heretics," said he. "See the rashness of a madman," replied she.\*

The case of Doctor Mann at Madrid was so serious as nigh to kindle to a blaze the discontents between Philip and Elizabeth. The depredation of the English upon his commerce annoyed the King of Spain continually, but he found no redress. The imprisonment of her subjects in the Inquisition of Spain irritated the Queen of England, but her representations were of no avail. The capture and detention of the treasure on which he depended for paying his army seemed to the King a curious manner of proving the entire love which was still protested by the Queen. The

present of a font of massive gold large enough to immerse him. There had not been seen in Edinburgh for seven years a bishop in pontifical habit.—*Ven. Cal.* 387.

\* "On the 25 Oct. while they were performing what they call the service in the Queen's chapel, an Englishman went up to the altar and cast down the cross and candlesticks, upon which he stamped, and at the same time shouted heretical and shameful words. They at once arrested him, but there has been no lack of people to excuse him by calling him mad. He was examined by some of the Council, and on being asked why he did it, he showed them a New Testament, and said that book had made him do it. He is in prison, but I think they will not hurt him much." Guzman to Philip, Nov. 1, 1567.—*Span. Cal.* 682. "Speaking to the Queen of the insolence of heretics and their enmity to princes, I instanced the Englishman who cast down and trampled on the cross and candlesticks in her own chapel: she replied that the man was mad, and thought that Our Lady and St. John, who were on either side of the cross, were Jews who wanted to crucify our Lord again. Others tell me that he is not mad but an evil-minded rogue. The cross is not set up again, but they say it is being repaired." Nov. 8.—*Ib.* 683. The man was acquitted. The cross was not erected again before Christmas; "but a piece of tapestry, with a crucifix, some candlesticks, and salvers were placed on the altar on the eve of the feast." Whereupon the man threw down a candlestick and was taken to the Tower.—*Ib.* 690.

correspondence between them through their ambassadors became strained amid the repeated expressions of good will and friendship. She had replied to the appointment of the ecclesiastic Don Guzman de Silva as ambassador to her court by sending an ecclesiastic to Spain in Doctor Mann of Cambridge, the Dean of Gloucester, who was not chosen for any conciliatory quality. Mann soon gave high offence by the freedom of his conversation about religion. He ridiculed a procession. He said publicly at a dinner that his Majesty of Spain was the only prince who defended the Papal sect, that the Prince of Condé would prevail, and that the Pope was nothing but a little canting monk. He carried himself so audaciously as to convince the King that he was prompted from home. Philip refused to hold intercourse with him, turned him out of Madrid, bidding him take a residence at some distance, and warned him that if he would not comply with the directions given him, the Inquisition should not be stayed from doing their duty on him.\* "He richly deserves the punishment of the Inquisition, he richly deserves to be burnt at the stake," Philip said with bitterness; "he has tried to persuade my subjects to the new and rebellious sects which are rife in other dominions, contrary the duties of an ambassador: his offices are bad and dangerous in sowing discord between two souls so united as the Queen and myself." But when the Queen of England

\* According to one report, the King of Spain laid himself in this matter under the feet of the fearful power which he was permitting to ruin his kingdom; and pleaded that he could not grant Elizabeth's requests, "being subject as others to the Inquisition." He called England a "*perdido y acabado reyno*": and was unwilling to deal with Mann because his friars told him that he was "a Lutheran, and excommunicatus excommunicatione majore, and all who resorted to him without license were in the like case."—Haynes' *State Papers*, p. 472.



was informed officially of these enormities, she replied that they were insignificant matters, of which no notice should be taken. "On the contrary," said Guzman, "they are in Spain so important that if he had not been your minister, he would have been punished in an exemplary manner." "Why," said she, "when the Bishop of Aquila was ambassador here, and was plotting against me and my realm, as I well knew, I seized his papers, opened them in his presence, and showed him what he had signed ; but took no further steps against him. I am grieved that my ambassador should be treated as he has been." In the end Mann, the cause of combat, in a condition of warm indignation, was withdrawn for a more tractable envoy : and on the other hand the King of Spain, recalling the amiable Guzman, who was thought to regard the Queen and her proceedings with too much equanimity, seated Spain in England in the person of Don Guerau de Spes, a fierce Catalonian knight, who instantly mixed himself in all the plots that were formed against the safety of Elizabeth.\* The political horizon was

\* Mann's particulars are in the *Spanish Calendar*, pp. 9, 18, 28, 29, 30, 40, 42. It might be noted that amid the remonstrances of both sides the forms of affection were preserved, and the intention of disrespect denied. When Elizabeth said that it was too much that her envoy should be expelled from the Court, however he might be disliked, Philip explained that he was not formally but personally banished, retaining his official house in Madrid, though requested to choose another residence outside. When it was complained that Mann's household were compelled to go to Mass, Philip denied it ; but that some of them having entered a church without showing respect to the Holy Sacrament were told either to behave themselves decently or leave. A fair summary of the whole dispute was given by the Venetian ambassador in Spain to the Doge. That the King of Spain affirmed Mann to be a scandalous person who could not live quietly, but used unbecoming language concerning religion against the pontifical dignity and the clergy, requesting his recall under threat of dismissal : that Elizabeth returned a very haughty answer, saying that he was a prudent man, and should not be condemned upon a first charge without defence. In the end Mann was dismissed without audience, the

thickening. On the day that Gueran landed, the Cardinal Châtillon arrived from Condé on a mission to move England, that is Elizabeth, in the behalf of the Huguenots.\*

In Lancashire and the North of England the Romanensians were strong. Mass commonly said: massing priests harboured: the English Service laid aside; ejected curates serving unfilled cures; churches shut up: the melancholy representation incensed the Queen, and drew a sharp rebuke upon the easy Bishop Downham of Chester. "We expected diligence in containing our subjects in the uniformity of religion: but we are deceived, we find great lack in you. Considering the place you hold, to be the principal minister in these causes, and such disorders found in your diocese as we hear not of the like in any other parts, we charge you to have other regard to your office. Provide your churches with honest men: use the ordinances and censures of the Church: make personal visitation, repairing into the remotest parts: see that obstinate persons, justly deprived, be not secretly maintained, to pervert our good subjects."† The Bishop, who had already received the powers of an ecclesiastical commissioner without much quickening, preferring to issue "precepts" rather than make personal visitation, was animated to traverse his diocese; and rejoiced to find himself received everywhere with kindness and hospitality. His cause was greatly aided by the voluntary zeal of Dean Nowell, a native of Lancashire, who was down there, who preached in divers places with great commendation, bringing many

King refusing to admit him to kiss hands. He went away in a rage. June, 1568.—*Ven. Cal.* 425, 426.

\* On September 3, 1568.—*Span. Cal.* 365.

† Strype's *Annals*, i. 544.

to conformity.\* The Bishop received some alarming depositions. It was deposed that there was a confederacy among the Romanensians: that many gentlemen were sworn together not to come to church in the time of service, or hear sermons, or receive the Holy Communion: that from Warrington all along the sea-coast the gentlemen had withdrawn themselves from religion: that there was a letter written from abroad exhorting the subject to acknowledge the Pope supreme head, and to swear obedience to him before some priest appointed: and to receive absolution if they had sworn to the royal supremacy, gone to church, or heard the Common Prayer. Two priests, named Norice, Butcher, or Fisher of Formby, and Peele or Pyck, were reported to be executing this letter in those parts. A number of gentlemen, refusing to answer upon oath to the Bishop, to the Articles and matter objected against them, were reported by him to the Privy Council, and committed to ward until they submitted themselves. The most obstinate was Sir John Southworth, a knight of Cheshire, "wholly unlearned, carried away with a zeal without knowledge," whose principal grounds were that "he would die in the faith of his fathers, in the faith wherein he was baptised." He made a partial submission to the Council, and was sent by them to Parker and the Ecclesiastical Commission, before whom he again partially submitted himself, but refused to subscribe to a form sent for his hand to Parker by the Council. He seems to have been dealt with leniently by all concerned, and let off. In a year he was in trouble again.†

\* Strype's *Annals*, i. 545.

† Council to Parker, and Parker to Council, July, 1568.—*Corresp.* 328, 330. Grindal to Cecil, Aug. 1569.—*Remains*, 305, 306. Cf. Strype's



Such obstinate gentlemen as these, it is probable, had listened to the whispers of the Papal agents who were beginning at this time to intrude themselves into the English realm. The question whether it were lawful on the part of adherents of the old religion to avoid penalty by conforming occasionally to the English Service had arisen, it has been seen, earlier: the fathers of Trent had been consulted on the case in their last gatherings, and a select number, to whom it was referred, had secretly pronounced a negative decision.\* Even if it were known in England, this was not held binding by the Romanensian clergy, the "old priests," the "ancient priests," the "priests of Queen Mary," as they began to be called: both those who had complied in expectation of a better day, and even those who had renounced livings for privacy, sinecures, or other modes of subsistence. They argued that as the Book of Common Prayer contained no positive heterodoxy, it was not under divine prohibition; it was not a sin, not a thing in nature evil, to frequent or permit to frequent a church where it was used: and they reflected that occasional conformity had been practised by their part in the days of Edward the Sixth.† Nor were they unaware of lenity extended to them in the reward of a decent acquiescence: nor

*Parker*, 264; *Annals*, i. 548; *Dom. Cal.* 312. He was, on his second disturbance, consigned to Nowell and again to Grindal, to be kept and taught. He proved himself an ungrateful guest. Their courtesy and humanity, "not without charge," wrought not on him to relent. He would not come to prayer or sermon. Nowell begged to be relieved of him. "I can do no good with him for altering his opinion in religion," said Grindal. But they implored Cecil not to put him in prison lest he should catch the sickness: and, for aught that is known, he was let off again.

\* See ch. xxxvi., *sub fin.*, above.

† I have ventured to put into their mouths some of the arguments which Dodd says that they used in vain a little later on to Cardinal Allen. — *Ch. Hist.* ii. 44; cf. *Butler's Engl. Catholics*, i. 310.

seemed it unlikely that the truce of several years, which had subsisted from after the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, would lapse into a general and indefinite peace, as those who had known the old religion were removed by death, and were succeeded by a generation which grew accustomed to the distant murmurs of futile anger, and heard in tranquillity unhistorical arguments, false accusations, needless admonitions touching unfounded claims, fictitious ecclesiastical sins, imaginary spiritual dangers. If it had been so, the religious history of England would have been different. But Rome was not to be ridded so easily. A severer course was opened by the resolute men who had fled their country for the sake of religion, the "Louvainists" as they were called: who had among them some of the most learned of their side. To these men the secret decision of Trent against the English worship was known. Three years after Trent, in 1566, under a new Pontiff, some of them invoked the intervention of Rome in the affairs of their own country: and Lawrence Vaux, sometime Warden of the collegiate church of Manchester, arrived in England with a letter written, apparently with Papal sanction, by Doctor Nicolas Sanders, the laborious author of the *De Visibili Monarchia*, better known afterwards as the historian of the English Schism. The letter breathed of tribulation, wrath, and menace. But, as Vaux complained, it was not seriously considered by the Romanensians. They put a liberal interpretation on it: "extenuated" and "diminished" it: and presently he wrote a violent enforcement of it, in which he declared that no one, layman or clergyman, who should be present at the English Service was "in the state of salvation."\*

\* This curious production is perhaps worth the type which it has

year, 1567, another instrument was procured against the peace of England in a "Bull of Reconcilement," which was made out to three of the Louvainists,

hitherto escaped. "I understand by your letter," says Vaux to some unknown Romanensian remonstrants, "that ye be in doubt how to understand the letter sent from Mr. Doctor Sanders to me." He compares them to mother Eve, who, when she "talked to the devil in the serpent," would not understand the plain words of the law of obedience, but "extenuated and diminished them." "I am charged," he proceeds, "to make a definitive sentence that all such as offer children to the baptism now used, or be present at the communion of service now used in churches in England, as well the laity as the clergy, do not walk in the state of salvation, neither we may not communicate or sociate ourselves in company with schismatics or heretics in divine things: there is no exception or dispensation can be had for any of the laity if they will stand in the state of salvation. Ye must not think this be any severity or rigorousness of the Pope, Pius V., that now is God's Vicar in earth, to whom at this present God hath appointed the government of His Church in earth: who for his singular virtues and sundry miracles that God by him hath wrought, excelleth all his predecessors that have been since Gregory's time, who sent St. Augustine and others with him to preach the faith in England. The Pope that now is hath no less zeal and good will to reduce England to the unity of Christ His Church than St. Gregory had, as he hath showed himself both in word and deed. And partly I heard him myself express in words and deed, being with him in his own private chamber at Rome: by my special friends I was brought into his chamber to hear him speak himself what a benefit was granted in the Consistory for England, to the intent I might make more plain declaration to Mr. Doctor Sanders and Dr. Harding concerning the authority granted unto them in the Consistory by the Pope for the soul's health of them that dwell in England. And for because I did partly know their commission, the said doctors earnestly requested and moved me to come into England, for (as they thought) I might be able to give some instruction to such as have authority under them in England as occasion serveth, they write to me, they put me in trust, and charged me to signify the truth to others that now be deceived through ignorance in matters of faith and conscience. I must therefore without halting, colouring, or dissembling, let tell you that the Pope cannot dispense any of the laity to entangle themselves with the schism as is aforewritten concerning sacraments and service: that ye may not be present amongst them. If ye associate yourselves at sacraments or service that is contrary to the unity of Christ His Church, ye fall in schism, that is to say, ye be separated from Christ His Church, and living in that state (as saith St. Augustine) although you lead never so good a life in the sight of the world, the wrath of God hangeth over you, and dying in that state shall lose the everlasting life in Heaven. It is no small danger



Thomas Harding, the antagonist of Jewel, Sanders himself, and another whose initial letters still overshadow the substance of his name. By this character-

to continue in schism. And ordinarily no priest in England hath authority to absolve from schism, except he have his authority from the Catholic See by Mr. Doctor Sanders and Mr. Doctor Harding, &c. (*sic*).” He goes on with Biblical examples and the Arian controversy, using some distressing language against the English Book. “There is not one of the old bishops nor godly priests of God that will be present at the schismatical service or damnable communion now used. For the which cause all have lost their living, some be in corporal prison, some in exile, and like good pastors be ready to suffer death in that cause. As it is the duty and office of the bishops to go before their flock as their leaders in matters of faith in religion, so the clergy and laity are bound to follow their examples, if they intend to be partakers with the bishops of the joys of heaven: and, thanks be to God, a number not only of the clergy, but, as well, of the temporalty, both of them that be worshipful and inferior to them, do follow their bishops constantly, and will in no wise come at the schismatical service. Such as frequent the schismatical service now used in the church in England, must either condemn them as fond foolish men that refuse to be present at service, or else their own conscience will accuse them that they do nought in that they do contrary to the examples given them of the bishops. I beseech you to consider all the days that you have to live in this world, although ye might a thousand years, is but a moment in comparison of the life everlasting. What doth it profit a man to have solace, pleasure, and prosperity that can be wished in this world, when everlasting torments do follow the same, for by much trouble and adversity we must enter into the glory of God, saith the Scripture; and as St. James saith, He that will flatter and dissemble with the world is enemy to God? I pray you the comfortable promise of our Saviour Christ in His Gospel, Whosoever will confess Christ and the faith of His spouse of the Catholic Church before men, He will confess him before His Father in Heaven, and whosoever denieth Christ and His Catholic faith before men, Christ will deny him before His Father in Heaven: he that loseth his life for Christ or the Catholic faith shall find everlasting joys: ye that have followed Me, shall Christ say, shall sit upon the seats judging the tribes of Israel: and at the day of judgment Christ shall say, Ye be they which have tarried with Me in My tentations and adversities, therefore I dispose unto you a kingdom that you may eat and drink upon My table in the kingdom of heaven. Thus, to conclude, your good examples in the premisses may not be salvation of only one soul, but upon your examples dependeth the salvation of a great number of the simple that know not the right hand from the left. Although this my rude letter appear hard, sharp, bitter, and sour, yet it is the truth, as I am persuaded in my conscience as I shall answer at the terrible day of judgment: and speaking in God’s cause I may not halt nor dissemble. What I write

istic decree episcopal power for the meditated purpose was assigned to certain priests, and the Pope superseded in effect the surviving Romanensian prelates who had maintained his cause in England. The Apostolic delegates, or legates, for so were they appointed by the Pope in Consistory, were armed with the episcopal power of absolving in the court of conscience those who should return to the bosom of the Church, and of dispensing irregularity incurred through heresy, on condition that priests who required such medicament should abstain from the ministry of the altar for three years.\* This commission was con-

here to you I would wish Sir Richard Mollineux, Sir W. Norris, and other my friends to be partakers, not only to hear this my rude letter, but to follow this counsel. Although it be simple and rude, yet I doubt not but it is true, as knoweth the Lord, who ever keep you and yours in health and prosperity. November, Anno 1566. Yours ever, L. V. Whosoever will be saved, afore all things in heart, word, and deed, he must keep the Catholic faith firmly, wholly, and inviolate, or else without doubt he shall perish in everlasting pain. Thus saith our creed.—Athanasius.”—*State Pap.*, *Dom. Eliz.*, vol. xli. No. 1; *Cal.* p. 281. This seems to be the earliest piece of official interference with England that is extant.

\* This Bull was published by John Day, in 1570, in a little tract written by Thomas Norton with a title, “A Bull granted by the Pope to Doctor Harding and other by reconcilment and assailing of English Papists to undermine faith and allegiance to the Queen: with a true declaration of the intention and fruits thereof, and a warning of perils thereby imminent not to be neglected.” Norton, a lawyer and man of letters, the coadjutor of Thomas Sackville in the *Tragedy of Gorboduc* (1590), the first English tragedy written on the Greek model, seems to have been a sort of official writer of the Queen’s employ in the matter of the Roman and northern troubles of this period. The Bull, exactly as he gives it, is as follows: “Noveritis quod anno, die, mense, et pontificatu infrascriptis in generali congregatione etc. pro parte Reverendorum T. Harding et N. S. et T. P. Anglorum fuit porrectum memoriale et supplicatio, quæ lecta fuerunt, etc. Annis abhinc tribus etc. concessit T. H. etc. Episcopalem potestatem in foro conscientiae absolvendi eos qui ad Ecclesiae gremio revertentur. Huic potestati quia multi non credunt, petimus ut in scriptum aliquod authenticum redigatur. Ac etiam ulterius (momente nos temporis necessitate) humiliter petimus ut eisdem concedatur in causa irregularitatis dispensandi potestas, exceptis ex homicidio voluntario provenientibus seu deductis in forum contentiosum, Quibus auditis

veyed from Rome to Louvain, and thence into England: whether by Vaux again, or by others, uncertain. It seems to have had but partial effect, the Romanensians in general still continuing shy of distant dictation, and refusing to step into the gulf that yawned before them: and two years later, in the spring of 1569, a more strenuous effort was put forth by Rome. Doctor Nicolas Morton, a former fellow of Trinity, and of the six preachers of Canterbury, an exile who had fled to Rome on Elizabeth's accession, and there

et intellectis prælibatus Sanctiss. Dominus noster decrevit quod prænominati absolvere possint in foro conscientiae Anglos tantum prout petitur, etiam ab irregularitate incursa ratione heresis et ab ea dependente emergente et annexa, dummodo absolvendi abstineant per triennium a ministerio altaris. In quorum fidem et testimonium etc. anno 1567 die Jovis 14 Aug. Et quia ego Notarius supradictus copiam ex proprio originali suo extractam collationavi et cum eodem concordare inveni, ideo subscripsi signoque meo solito signavi in fidem premissorum rogatus. Forma Absolutionis. Dominus noster Jesus Christus qui dedit discipulis suis potestatem ligandi et solvendi, Ipse te absolvat, et ego autoritate omnipotentis Dei et beatorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, necnon sanctæ matris Ecclesiæ, atque autoritate Papalis indulgentiæ in hac parte mihi commissa et concessa, absolve te ab omni irregularitate et sententia excommunicationis majoris vel minoris a jure vel ab homine tibi inflictis: atque etiam ab omnibus criminibus, excessibus et peccatis tuis confessis, contritis et oblitis, et ab omnibus casibus Sedi Apostolicæ reservatis. Restituo te communitati fidelium et Sacramentis Ecclesiæ, ac in illam innocentiam et puritatem in qua eras quando baptizatus fuisti, remittendo tibi omnes pœnas Purgatorii propter culpas et offensiones quas contra Deum et proximum tuum commisisti, et plenariam remissionem atque indulgentiam omnium peccatorum in quantum claves Ecclesiæ extendunt in hac parte tibi do et concedo, ita quod sis absolutus hic et ante tribunal Domini nostri Jesu Christi, habeasque vitam æternam, et vivas in eo in sæcula sæculorum. Amen. In nomine Patris, &c." Then follows an English translation, in which "pontificatus" is "bishopric"; and there is a note that "the petition was made in the name of three, but it was granted to four." Then follows "The Declaration and Warning," wherein the Pope is "the common enemy of all Christian truth, and of all just crowns and dignities of kings," who urges subjects to revolt against "her Majesty's supreme and universal ancient authority in her whole realm over all her subjects, which they have in Parliament and otherwise orderly and truly recognised." There are some illustrative remarks on this.



became an apostolical, that is a Papal penitentiary, was sent by the Pope into England to impart to some of the Romanensian priests faculties of absolution, and other engines, and to make known to special persons that Elizabeth was to be deposed by a Bull that was coming.\* This agent landed in Lincolnshire and perambulated the north. He brought with him trinkets for distribution. He reconciled some of the gentry, in particular the Earl of Northumberland. He enlisted emissaries, who insinuated themselves into various parts of the kingdom; and a considerable stir was begun. Clandestine meetings, conversations, and compacts, a subdued commotion, a perplexing uneasiness, ran through many neighbourhoods. Curious badges or tokens were distributed. The byeword, or password, of "a golden day" to come was whispered. The affair began to partake the darkness and peril of a plot. Upon the Romanensians, who would have been quiet enough, if they had been let alone, an embarrassing decision was pressed. The great part remained as they were. But some, who had hitherto not hesitated to frequent the English Service, were noted to have withdrawn themselves therefrom. Others, in number not inconsiderable, fled over seas precipitately, dreading the future, or perhaps to evade the consequences of a distressing secret obligation.†

\* Sanders says, in the *De Visibili Monarchia*, that in 1569 Pius V. sent into England Nicolas Morton, D.D. "Unum ex presbyteris qui penitentiis indicendis Romæ præerant, in Angliam misit, ut certis illustribus et Catholicis viris autoritate Apostolica denunciaret Elizabetham, quæ tunc rerum potiebatur, hereticam esse, ob eamque causam omni dominio et potestate, quam in Catholicos usurpabat, jure ipso excidisse, impuneque ab illis velut ethnicam et publicanam haberi posse; nec eos illius legibus aut mandatis deinceps obedire cogi." And that thereupon these nobles thought of liberating their brethren from the tyranny of heretics.—Lib. vii. p. 730, ed. 1571.

† "It is not unknown how, for such reconciliation, assemblies have

The adventurous flight of the ruined Queen of Scots into England gave the spreading disaffection a rallying point. From the field of Longside, Mary crossed the Solway in an open fishing boat on May 16, 1568, to Workington: whither the Romanensian Lowther, the Deputy Warden, came next day, and escorted her to Carlisle. Her coming was the great calamity of Elizabeth. Instead of retaining her within the kingdom, if Elizabeth had conveyed her without delay to France or Spain, or whithersoever she asked to be sent, she would have consulted well for her own peace and her own fame.\* In the castle of Carlisle she held court, in a manner, the gentry crowding to her presence. The Earl of Northumberland, Sir Nicolas

been suspiciously made, substitutes have been deputed, and the like by many exercised, to creep into deceived subjects' hearts and draw them to be wailing of their supposed miseries, and to a desire of returning to the fanciful superstitions of Rome. How famous is the delivery of badges and tokens with five wounds, &c., as it were for marks of a faction! How notorious is their byeword of their golden day."—Norton, in the Tract quoted at p. 220. Again, "It is well known that some papistical fellows that of late years did communicate and frequent common prayer according to the order of our Church, do of late time, belike since their reconciliation according to this wicked order, abstain from communion and common prayer. And what is the reason? *Aliquid monstri alunt.*" Again, "What maketh the late flying of papists in such heaps, as those that took shipping near Colchester and other, but a trust to return to pleasant fruition . . . of the mischief that they have brewed? What intention have they that run away leaving letters behind them to pray favour of the Queen's true officers with an intimation or inkling of promise to be good another day to those who show them favour now?" Again, "The silly abused men are borne in hand that they are out of the Church, as it were out of the Ark, wrestling for life in the mid main sea in peril of drowning."

\* The sagacious Parker uttered a foreboding note. "I am much careful for the success that may rise to the Queen's person and the realm by the arrival of the Scottish Lady. I fear *quod bona Regina nostra auribus lupum tenet.* I trust in God ye have amongst yourselves well considered." To Cecil, July, 1568.—*Corresp.* 325. Her retention, which was against the Queen's better judgment, and due to Cecil, was ordinary policy dealing with an extraordinary contingency. Elizabeth had better have risked any mischief that she might have done by getting to the continent.

Fairfax and his son Sir William, Mr. Hungate, and Mr. Vavasor, "all unsound in religion," were first, from Yorkshire—the Earl with great offers and professions : that he thought himself bound for the honour of the Queen of England to come for the defence of the Queen of Scots against pursuit ; that he desired to have the custody of the Queen of Scots committed to himself, the Deputy Warden being "too base a man" for the charge. He alleged that the Council of the North at York had given him letters of authority in that behalf to the justices of Cumberland. On the other hand, the Deputy Warden stoutly refused to quit his charge on any such warrant, or even to suffer the Earl to see the Queen with more attendance than his page, "as though he had been a suspect person." Elizabeth lost no time in dispatching Lord Scrope and Sir Francis Knowles with authority to take charge of the regal supplicant : who on their way down were met by the indignant Earl and his companions, to whom Knowles spake roundly of their repair to the Queen of Scots without the command of their own sovereign, at the same time blaming, though partially exonerating, the Council of the North for their precipitancy. Thus from the day of her advent Mary brought debate and discussion with her. Scrope and Knowles themselves were impressed, though not subdued, by her extraordinary fascination. "We found her," said they, "to have an eloquent tongue and a discreet head ; she hath stout courage and liberal heart." Knowles remarked her free and ensnaring manners, her vindictive and conquering nature. "She regards no ceremony beside the acknowledging of her estate regal. Her disposition is to speak much, to be bold, pleasant, and very familiar. She delights to hear of hardiness and valour ; she shows great



desire to be avenged of her enemies. The thing that she most thirsteth after is victory ; for victory's sake pain and perils seem pleasant to her, in respect of victory wealth and all things seem to her contemptible and vile. What is to be done with such a princess and lady? It is vanity to think that she will be stayed by straw from bringing the French into Scotland, or from employing all her force of money, men, and friendship to satisfy her appetite to shed the blood of her enemies." She made nothing of imprisonment. In riding she galloped so fast that they feared she might escape into Scotland ; and so forbade her the pastime. To prevent the resort of gentlemen to her they made an example of Mr. Lascelles of Yorkshire, "a lewd practiser and arrogant papist," who came to Carlisle of purpose to see her. They refused this, declaring to him that "no subject ought to honour another prince in form of visitation or welcome without conduction of some of his superiors"; then they appointed a gentleman to return with him to his lodgings, wait there until he had made him ready to ride, and see him out of the gates of the city.\* In July she was removed to Bolton Castle. The indecisive and distressing conferences or courts of enquiry concerning her, begun at York and transferred to Westminster, were not concluded or dissolved before the first month of the following year, 1569. About that time she was conveyed to Tutbury Castle for greater security. There she refused not to hear the English Service.†

\* Wright, i. 289.

† "She heard the English Service with a book of the Psalms in English in her hand, which she showed me after." White to Cecil.—Wright, i. 308. She continued to conform to the English Service, but took means to let her adherents know that she was unchanged in religion.

Her letters reached the Pope : whom her cause conjoined with the King of Spain more closely than some other affairs of the age. The new Spanish ambassador, who arrived in England nearly at the time that she did, flung himself into the whole intrigue, which henceforth set down her liberation as the first step to be taken in the proposed revolution. "I have received," wrote he to his master when Mary was still at Bolton, "from the Queen of Scotland a letter of credence for the Bishop of Ross, who promises to come and see me. It appears as if the time was approaching when this country may be made to return to the Catholic Church."\* A few months later he informed him that the Earl of Northumberland had been in disguise to see him at four in the morning, and was ready to serve his Majesty. The Duke of Norfolk and the Earl of Arundel were also in communication with him, and sent to Philip the same offer of service.† From Mary he received a verbal message, to be sent to the King : that if he would help her, she would be Queen of England in three months, and Mass should be said all over the country."‡ His own opinion was the same.§ The Lord Dacre, Norfolk's cousin, told him that whenever the King of Spain were pleased to send an army into England, he and his friends would provide fifteen thousand choice troops to aid it.|| He himself, as ambassador, had the

\* Guerau de Spes to Philip, 6 Nov., 1568.—*Span. Cal.* 83.

† *Ib.* pp. 96, 136, 138.

‡ *Ib.* p. 96.

§ "If the Queen does not change her government voluntarily there will be a rising here in a month. If any disturbance arises here, either by the action of these gentlemen, or otherwise, the government may be overthrown : and, if the matter is taken up vigorously, the country may be mastered, or at least may be brought to what is desired." To Philip, Ap. 1569.—*Ib.* 143.

|| June, 1569.—*Ib.* p. 167.

assurance to write a long memorial to Elizabeth, requesting her to return to the bosom of the Church, that is, of the Roman See.\* He held stormy interviews with Cecil, of whom he spoke with habitual contempt to his own master.† One of his letters, full of violent expressions, fell into Cecil's hands. As his house was a hotbed of intrigue, Cecil ceremoniously detained him and his servants within doors for a time, going thither himself for the purpose with Lord Clinton, the Lord Admiral, and a large train, taking the names, and putting them under inspection.‡ This was an extraordinary measure: but it was not resented by Philip, and it had no effect on Guerau. When Cecil drew up a Proclamation in the Queen's name to explain the recent proceedings in regard to Spain, then "Don Guerau de Spes, knight of the Order of Calatrava," drew up another in his own name to contradict it.§ This mad ambassador was a great cause why the rising against Elizabeth and the reformed religion burst before it was ripe, and prematurely discharged

\* *Span. Cal.* p. 85. This memorial is without date, but probably about the beginning of 1569. He had three copies made and sent to the King. It is not likely that the King let him send it to Elizabeth.

† For instance: "These heretic knaves of the Council are going headlong to perdition, incited by Cecil, who is indescribably crazy in his zeal for heresy."—*Ib.* p. 95.

‡ To the King, 8 Jan., 1569, *Ib.* 97. He also wrote to the Duke of Alva, by Cecil's permission, about the same affair, in this style: "Cecil and the Admiral came on the same day to my lodging. The Admiral said a few, not unamiable, words; and Cecil many and harsh, blaming your Excellency and myself most arrogantly for what had passed. He took a list of my servants, rigorously forbidding any of them to leave the house except one Englishman. He also refused to allow any one to come and visit me; and vapoured about religion and the Mass, dragged up the matter of John Mann, and about Bishop Quadra's affairs; and, in short, did and said a thousand impertinent things. He thinks he is dealing with Englishmen, who all tremble before him."—*Ib.* 98. Guerau was moved into Winchester House, and set free from all restraint in July.—*Ib.* 169, 172.

§ In May, 1569.—*Ib.* 149.



only its own weakness in the angry face of the power that it provoked. There were not wanting, on the other hand, cooler heads abroad to calculate the difficulties of an English enterprise. The keen Alva could weigh them, and advise his master on no account to break with England yet. He remarked that the letters of Guerau threw little light on affairs : and told Guerau plainly that the Queen of Scots was being ruined by his plots.\* Alva however, in this the greatest year of his cruel glory, was on the alert : he was in communication with the north of England, and ready to second any favourable event. He attempted at this moment to gain more certain information of the state of things in England. Under pretence of arranging the question of the Spanish treasure detained by the Queen—a very sore point—he sent over one of his ablest captains, the Marquis Vitelli, with an escort of sixty men. The reception of his emissary gave him what he wanted. The choice of a soldier for such business seemed to convey a menace. An English captain met Vitelli at the port, and forbade him to advance into the kingdom with more than six of his sixty. He made the best of it : he was courteously received : and Alva discovered that the Queen was not to be braved. But the caution which counselled delay ensured not preparation. Philip did nothing : France did nothing : the Pope did not enough, delaying to fulminate the tremendous Bull which he had been forging :† and when the insurrection of the north

\* “You are not to entertain proposals from anybody. I must again press this upon you ; and tell you that I am informed from France that the Queen of Scotland is being utterly ruined by the plotting of her servants with you, as they never enter your house without being watched. This might cost the Queen her life ; and I am not sure that yours would be safe.” July, 1569.—*Span. Cal.* p. 175. See also p. 149.

† Sanders, who ought to have known, imputes the failure of the rising

broke out, it burned itself away in its own region. The rest of the country knew not of it.

In the summer of 1569 a combination of the English nobility proposed to Mary Stuart to restore her to her throne upon several conditions, among which was a religious one; that she should establish in her kingdom the system of worship of the English Reformation. She accepted this condition along with the rest, but it cannot have been with serious purpose. Though she conformed herself during her captivity to the English Service, yet she contrived at the same time to signify to her own adherents that in her heart she was unchanged. The letter in which these proposals were conveyed was signed by a number of the highest rank: the combination included many others, and spread far and wide. It entirely respected the interests of Elizabeth, and appeared to offer a tolerable composition of difficulties. Cecil was in it, and the Queen had knowledge of it: but the main stipulation, the wedge of the rest, the marriage of a subject, none dared offer to her sanction: and the matter, proceeding so, had the nature of a conspiracy. As soon as it pleased the Queen to notice it, she dispersed it at a touch, with an ease which showed that the age of king-makers was gone by. A plot of paper ended in the arrest of some, the partial disgrace of Leicester himself, and the final, though deferred, execution of the first peer of the realm, the amiable and virtuous Duke of Norfolk, who by family belonged to the old, by personal preference to the new religion, and in whom, by the marriage of a suitable English subject

to this cause. "Sed reliquis Catholicis, propterea quod adhuc per Papam non erat publice contra Reginam lata excommunicationis sententia, nec ab ejus ipsi absoluti viderentur obedientia, se non adjungentibus, facile (*sic*) regis copiis in vicinam Scotiam fugati sunt," the northern nobles who took arms.—*De Schism. Angl.* p. 290.

with the Scottish Queen, England and Scotland and the Scottish rage of religion were to have been pacificated : they to have been cemented, and the Scottish rage controlled by the means of the Book of Common Prayer.\* It left exposed the great northern Earls who were implicated in it, but far more deeply in their own designs, which were wholly different. Northumberland and Westmoreland were summoned to the Court to

\* As to these complications, Sir Francis Knollys, Mary's keeper, says that Mary was offered terms by Elizabeth through Herries, that she would restore her to her throne, if she would renounce her claim to the Crown, repudiate the French league, and "abandon the Mass in Scotland, and receive the Common Prayer after the form of England." A little further on, "touching the condition of this Queen receiving of the form of Common Prayer after the manner of England, I said unto my lord Herries that if he meant thereby to condemn the Form and Order of Common Prayer now used in Scotland, and to insist on the English, . . . he might bring the substance of religion in peril." He goes on that Mary "hath grown to a very good liking of our Common Prayer, and she hath received an English chaplain to her service, and she hath heard him in his sermons inveigh against Pharisaical justification of works and all kind of papistry, and that to the advancement of the Gospel with attentive and contented ears. And she hath seemed repentantly to acknowledge that her offences and negligences of her duty towards God hath justly deserved the injurious punishment, as she saith, and disgrace done unto her by her adversaries in her own country." He adds that he doubts her good faith in this; and fears that Cardinal Lorraine and the Guises may recall her to perilous enterprises. To Cecil, July 28, 1568.—J. Anderson's *Collection*, iv. 109. On this letter Froude founds the remark that Mary "had even learned the slang of Protestant theology" (ix. 267). The condition about religion and the English Prayer Book seems to have been somewhat misunderstood by historians. Hume says it was "that the Protestant religion should be established by law in Scotland"; Lingard, that she "should allow the English reform to be established in Scotland"; Froude, that it was "and finally the establishment in Scotland of the forms and constitution of the Anglican Church" (ix. 283). No such thing. It is plain from Knollys' letter that it was nothing more than the restoration of the English Prayer Book, which had been received in Scotland at first, but lately cast out by Knox. There is a paper in the Record Office, giving the conditions, which proves this unmistakably. "The religion already established in Scotland to continue, and no other to be used except the same and the formular of England." This is in Cecil's handwriting.—MSS. *Dom. Eliz.*, xlvii, No. 36, *Cal.* p. 313.



explain themselves. They feared or neglected to come: and at once with incredible rashness precipitated themselves into open insurrection.\*

On November 8 the Earls raised their standard at Brancepeth, the seat of the Earl of Westmoreland.†

\* The combination was connected on the part of the northern Earls with the dangerous designs of the foreign enemies of England, which had their centre in the Queen of Scots. Norfolk had no share in these, and disappointed those who had. The Earls of Northumberland, Westmoreland, Cumberland, and Derby, proposed in October to Philip to restore the detained Spanish goods within a year, if he would aid them with a small force of arquebusiers, after they had released Mary by force, and seized the north. Guerau de Spes to the King, Oct. 8, 1569.—*Span. Cal.*, p. 199. A month later, immediately before the unfurling of the banner in the north, the affair of the Duke of Norfolk appears to have been magnified into a rising in the eyes of foreigners. Alva wrote to Cardinal Pacheco to announce it: Pacheco flew to Morone: and the two together sought the Pope, and were “a long while with his Holiness to consider how they could promote this insurrection against the Queen of England, because they thought it would be easy to assist it through the medium of the Duke of Alva,” &c. The Venetian Ambass. at Rome to the Signory, Nov. 5.—*Ven. Cal.*, p. 439.

† It is difficult to fix the exact days of this ill-starred enterprise, especially at the beginning: and the expression that they raised their standard on Nov. 8 must be accepted generously. They repaired to Brancepeth on Nov. 6.—*Sharp's Mem. of the Rebellion*, p. 10. On Nov. 8 the Earl of Northumberland went to Topcliffe, and Westmoreland went somewhere else, with a vacillating purpose of repairing to York to clear themselves.—*Ib.*, p. 12. On Nov. 9 the Earl of Sussex wrote to each of them sharply to repair to him at once.—*Dom. Cal.*, Addenda, p. 102. On Nov. 10 they both returned to Brancepeth, and were joined by their chief adherents, Norton, Reed, Markenfield, in a formal rendezvous: on this day they bought up all the bows and arrows in Barnard Castle and in Durham.—*Sharp*, p. 15. On Nov. 11 Sir Geo. Bowes flung himself into Barnard Castle.—*Ib.* p. 19. On Nov. 12 the muster at Brancepeth was still going on: the country was full of armed parties riding hither and thither: but the meaning of it all was unknown, no proclamation having been issued.—*Ib.* p. 18. On Nov. 13, Sunday, it was expected that they would have an “open Mass” in Durham.—*Ib.* p. 25. On Nov. 14 they entered Durham, and performed their exploits there.—*Ib.* p. 36. (The letter of Bowes, of Nov. 15, which describes their doings in Durham, is misdated as Nov. 10 in Wright's *Elizabeth*, i. 331.)

† The Earl of Northumberland had put strong garrisons in Alnwick and Warkworth Castles. “If Alnwick and Warkworth were taken,”

On the same day they wrote to the Pope, describing the miseries and calamities of the kingdom and subjecting themselves to the authority of the Papal See, a letter which took three months to reach Rome.\* On November 14 they marched to Durham with three hundred horse, headed by an ancient gentleman, Richard Norton, Westmoreland's relation, who carried a banner of the Five Wounds, with his nine sons behind him. They entered the minster, overthrew the Communion Table, tore the Bible in pieces, took away all the books but one, forbade in the Queen's name any service to be used before their further pleasure

remarked Sir John Forster, "it would be a great stay to this country, and the Earls would have no retreat here." To Sussex, Alnwick, Nov. 25.—*Cal. Dom.* Addenda, p. 126. Forster, who afterwards shared with Hunsdon the glory of the victory of Hell Beck, moved the indignation of his brave commander by the ravage that he made of those noble fastnesses, of which he became Warden. "It is pity to see how Alnwick Castle and Warkworth are spoiled by him and his; and if some order be not taken, her Majesty will be at no small charges to repair the same. In the abbey in Hull park he has left neither lead, glass, iron, nor even the pipes of lead that conveyed the water to the house, but has brought it to his own house, and means utterly to deface both Warkworth and Alnwick." April, 1572, to Burleigh.—*Cal. Dom.*, Addenda, p. 393. Cf. pp. 208, 218.

\* It reached Rome February 8, as appears from the Pope's answer, Raynaldus, p. 179. Their letter has perished. The Pope, in his answer, Feb. 22, 1570, imagining the rebellion to be still on foot, blessed and felicitated the authors of it, promised money to support them, and referred them to Ridolfi, a Florentine factor in London, who had long been his secret agent. An English version of his letter is given in *A Brief Historical Account of the Jesuits*, 1689, p. 35: and both English and Latin have been recently reprinted by Prof. Collins in his *Queen Elizabeth's Defence*, App. 1. The Pope sent 12,000 crowns to the rebels, as the remarkable Bishop of Ross, Mary's agent, confessed in his examination: and it was "principally procured by the means of a doctor called Morton, or some such like name, who the summer before the rebellion had been in the North parts, and had reconciled the Earl of Northumberland and divers others to the Church of Rome." Ross added that he had been advertised of the distribution of that sum by a letter of thanks that he had received from the Countess of Northumberland.—Murdin, p. 60.

should be known, therewith protesting that what they had done was according to the Queen's proceeding.\* On the next day they threw off the mask by issuing a Proclamation in which they announced their purpose to be the restoration of the old religion.† This was published at Durham, Richmond, Darlington, Staindrop, and other towns.‡ It was immediately answered by Sussex in a counter Proclamation in which he spoke of the Earls with some contempt.§ They now moved

\* Sir Geo. Bowes to the Earl of Sussex, Barnard Castle, Nov. 10, 1569.—Wright, p. 331. The Spanish ambassador gave a much more stately account of this piece of work. "The Earls of Northumberland, Westmoreland, and Cumberland, with 5,000 men and 400 horses, entered the city of Durham, where, after having pulled down the wooden table used by the heretics in the cathedral, they had Mass performed with great ceremony: and now intend to go to York with a similar object." To Philip, Nov. 20.—*Span. Cal.*, p. 211. Sussex says, "They were in armour at Durham yesterday, and have torn the Bible asunder, and thrown down the Communion board, and made their show to be religion." To the Queen, Nov. 15.—*Cal. of State Pap., Dom.*, Addenda, p. 107.

† Mr. Froude says that this Proclamation was addressed by the Earls, as "the Queen's true and faithful subjects, to all the same of the old Roman Catholic faith" (ix. 516). He professes to be quoting it. This is the sort of thing to make any one despair of historical accuracy. It was impossible for such words as "the Roman Catholic faith" to have been used at that time. It was "to all the same of the old and Catholic faith." It also speaks of "the true and Catholic religion." See it in *Cal. Dom.*, Addenda, p. 111: and, imperfectly, in Strype, i. 583. It has also been recently reprinted by Professor Collins, in his *Queen Elizabeth's Defence*, with the original spelling. Another form of the Proclamation, as it was made at Darlington, "penned by Thomas Jenny at the dictation of Marmaduke Blakiston, by command of the Earl of Westmoreland," is extant. This speaks of the "true and Catholic religion": and declares against "a new found religion and heresy, contrary to God's word," which had been established by the space of twelve years by "divers new set up nobles about the Queen," who went about "to overthrow and put down the ancient nobility of the realm."—Sharp's *Mem. of the Rebellion*, p. 42. In these manifests they audaciously asserted that their object was to do what foreign powers would do if none other did, and so to keep foreign powers out of the island.

‡ Sharp, p. 39.

§ "The Earls with their confederates, to cover their wicked attempts, have deluded the Queen's subjects, pretending for conscience sake to



southward. At Darlington they heard Mass, driving the people to it at the point of the staff, and reviewed their forces. Northumberland then scoured Richmond, Northallerton, and Boroughbridge; and the two Earls together, November 20, heard Mass at Ripon. Everywhere they found their musters slow.\* They constrained by force the towns to assemble, armed and unarmed alike; and compelled them to follow them under threat of burning and spoiling. But the people were hard to move, mistrusting both the cause and the ability of the leaders. The Earls stood little on the dignity of their order. If they fell in with a gentleman's

reform religion, when many of them never respected any religion, but continued a dissolute life till driven to pretend to popish holiness. They declare that they are driven to take this matter in hand lest foreign princes should, when indeed they have practised with foreign princes to aid them in this wicked enterprise, and thereby sought to bring the realm under the slavery of foreign powers," &c.—*Cal. Dom.*, Addenda, p. 104: where the date assigned, Nov. 13, should be Nov. 28. See the whole Proclamation, printed for the first time, in Collins' *Queen Elizabeth's Defence*, p. 21. There was a good deal of magnanimity in Sussex. He often in his dispatches speaks of the Earls as simpletons, misled by dark and crafty men: which seems to have been the general opinion. He advises the Queen to try money before force. He was a careful and good commander. The Queen treated him with Tudor ingratitude: but in the opinion of Hunsdon and Sadler, who were well able to judge, she never had an abler or better servant. He wrote an indignant letter to Cecil on the treatment that he received. See Collins, p. 27.

\* Well they might. The Queen's musters had been made throughout the length and breadth of the land a few months before, in the summer. The orders, commissions, lists of commissioners, and certificates returned still remain. See *Calendar, Dom. Eliz.*, p. 333 onwards. The two Earls themselves had been of the Commissioners of Musters for the counties of York and Durham. It might be remarked that the town of Hartlepool refused to appear at Durham, alleging that they belonged to Northumberland. Bishop of Durham, Earl of Westmoreland, and other Commissioners for the County Palatine of Durham to the Council, June 28, p. 335. Later on the Queen sent letters to the county lieutenants "to be always ready on an hour's notice to serve with all the chief men of the county against any stir," Nov. 20: and horse and foot, to the number of near eleven thousand, were appointed to be at several places on Dec. 10 or 12.—Haynes' *State Papers*, pp. 559, 562.

servant, they would bid him tell his master "upon pain of spoil" to join them. From such sources they mostly drew their following; but with the commonalty they had small success. They of Richmond told Northumberland that they would escort him to the limit of their bounds, but no further; when he desired that only a hundred of them should go, but that they should be armed, they answered that they would all go, but unarmed: and this they did to the number of three hundred. When they halted on reaching the limit, he urged them again to join him, but in vain; and when, as they turned to go, some of the Earl's servants tried to take from them some bills and steel caps, they bade them desist, "or they should win them with stripes." To arm their motley following, in particular the footmen, was one of their main difficulties. One of Norton's sons, with a hundred horsemen, entered a farmer's house, pressed his son into the service, and carried off six corselets, six morions, and two or three arquebuses.\* By such means they raised their force of about a thousand to six or seven times as many, very ill furnished: and with a new Proclamation, in which they declared their purpose to be the liberation of the Scottish Queen,† moved southward with some

\* Sir George Bowes' letters, in Sharp's *Memorials*, and Wright's *Elizabeth*, vol. i.

† It is worth remark that Lingard labours to prove, from this second Proclamation, that the primary object of this rebellion was not religious. "It must be admitted that the Earls and the chief of their followers were Roman Catholics: that Morton had informed them of the Papal process against Elizabeth, and of the sentence which in a short time would be published against her: and that in their Proclamation at Durham, and in their applications for aid to foreign powers, they professed to have in view the Catholic worship. This, however, was only a secondary object. They sought in the first place the liberation of the Scottish Queen," &c. See his Note (Q), vol. v. It might rather be thought that the object which they put first was their first object. The liberation of Mary was the means to that end. It is shabby in the Roman Catholic historian to disown these unfortunate champions of the Papal cause.

dispatch. Passing York, where Elizabeth's general, the Earl of Sussex, lay with a force of three thousand men, they reached Tadcaster about November 22. A ride of fifty miles with a picked body of horse, the design of Northumberland, would have brought him to Tutbury and Mary, whose capture or rescue might have been effected by surprise, and would have changed greatly the aspect of things. It might have laid York open, raised the north effectually, and brought Alva to Hartlepool. But while it hung in deliberation (such strokes need swiftness) the opportunity passed. A courier from London (the design was suspected, Cecil had been warned two days before) reached Tutbury posthaste, November 23, bringing an order, which was obeyed on the instant, for the removal of Mary to Coventry. The Earls began to retreat. Skirting York, which they could not venture to attack, they invested Barnard Castle, belonging to Westmoreland himself, which was held against them eleven days by Sir George Bowes. The siege was bloodless; the few culverins of the besiegers made no impression (it is not wise to batter one's own house); the mounted men of the garrison rode out by night and joined Sussex at York; the foot, or many of them, mutinied, leaped the walls, and joined the insurgents.\* Meantime Northumberland's brother, Sir Henry Percy, and Sir John Forster were collecting forces for the Queen along the border; and when Westmoreland moved upon Durham, which he occupied, they came down upon him, and a hot but indecisive skirmish

\* "I found the people in the castle in continual mutinies, seeking not only by great numbers to leap the walls, but also by all means to betray the place and deliver it to the rebels. 226 men leaped over the walls and ran to the enemy: of which 35 broke their necks, legs, and arms in the leaping." Bowes to Cecil, Dec. 14.—*Cal. Dom.*, Add., p. 150; or Sharp's *Mem. of the Rebellion*, p. 100.



ensued. Sussex advanced from York, December 11, with a main army, increased to twelve thousand by the arrival of the Lord Admiral Clinton and the Earl of Warwick. As he approached, the insurgents fled in disorder from Durham to Hexham. Thence they made their way into Cumberland with a small remnant of their forces, and visited Lord Dacre of Gilsland at Naworth, their party diminished to a few score riders: the Earls themselves and their Countesses, Swinburne, Tempest, Markenfield, the Nortons, some other gentlemen, and their followers. They tarried not long at Naworth, unwelcome, discredited, before they made their way into Scotland, in the beginning of January, 1570. Great complications followed between the kingdoms: demands, refusals, menaces, and the merciless ravage of the south of Scotland, after the manner of the Tudors, in the midst of the confusion caused by the assassination of the Regent Murray, which befel at this moment, January 23. The Earls and their following suffered the privations and miseries of outlawry for some months, when the rest got away to Flanders, and Northumberland was sold to the English by the new Scottish Regent, Morton, after a captivity of two years. He was beheaded at York, vehemently professing on the scaffold his devotion to the old religion.\* The vengeance taken by

\* August 22, 1572. The price paid for the Earl was £2,000. The Scots wished the money to be sent in a ship to Leith. This was refused by Lord Hunsdon, and the Earl was sent in a Scottish ship to Alnmouth, where Hunsdon received him, and took him to Berwick, after paying the money. Hunsdon then had to minister articles to him, which he did reluctantly. At the end of the process Cecil wrote to him to convey the Earl to York for execution. Hunsdon, who always showed himself a man of noble and high feeling, refused to do this. "Your packet," said he, "gave me my dinner, to which I was sitting down when I received it. I a carrier of any nobleman to execution, withal unto a place where I have nothing to do! I will suffer imprisonment sooner. I will deliver

the Queen upon the population of the region of the rebellion was horrible. When fear and resentment stirred a Tudor, up sprang a fountain of blood. The revenge of Henry after the Pilgrimage of Grace, of Mary after the rebellion of Wyatt, was not more ferocious than Elizabeth's visitation of Northumberland's insurrection. The district over which the movement had gone, from Newcastle to Wetherby, sixty miles long and forty broad, was abandoned to martial law. The gentlemen, any that had lands, were reserved for trial, attainder, and forfeiture; the poorer people were given to the rope. In every market town Sir George Bowes, knight marshal, held assize, and some were hanged, often they scarce knew why: for speaking to a rebel, for carrying a message. Near a thousand perished thus.\* Terror and desperation

him safely to Alnwick, but no further by my will: and I will not stir hence with him till I have answer from you again." Sharp's *Memorials*, p. 331. Bridgewater gives a wonderful account of the extreme devotion of this unfortunate Earl in his Scottish prisons, passing whole days in prayer and fasting. Among other things he says that he refused to worship an image of Elizabeth: "Hortabantur ut adoraret idolum Elizabethæ": though he does not seem to believe this himself.—*Concertatio*, p. 47. Lord Hunsdon says that he would talk of little but hunting and hawking: and that he was timid in answering his articles, not from fear but vacillation. Thomas Percy has been beatified by the present Pope within the last few years. His lot was happier than that of Westmoreland, who lived abroad on a slender pension from the King of Spain, and strove to earn it by furnishing facilities to the enemies of his country. Neither of them showed ability, or did anything considerable. In the Proclamation against them in November on the outbreak, they were called "as ill-chosen two persons, if their qualities were considered, to have credit, as could be in the whole realm. For they were both in poverty, one having but a very small portion of that which his ancestors had left, and the other having wasted almost his whole patrimony."—Strype, *Ann.* i. 586. Burleigh, in his *Execution of Justice*, says much the same.

\* The severity of this retribution is acknowledged in the "Thanksgiving for the Suppression of the last Rebellion," which may be seen at the end of the *Second Book of Homilies*: "Most dreadfully hast scourged some of the seditious persons with terrible executions." The plan of it all, laid out deliberately, may be read in Cecil's "Memorial of proceedings to be

reigned. An anonymous remonstrance reached Cecil that the misery of the people would lead them into new commotions out of mere despair.\* Bishop Pilkington told Cecil that the number of offenders was so great that few innocent were left to try the guilty. So many husbandmen, who had goods to lose, were sent to York for process of law, that the Attorney-General protested that, if this were not stopped, many places would be left naked of inhabitants. As to the richer sort, a vast harvest was expected from their possessions escheating to the Crown : and so it came

adopted in the North," *Cal. Dom.*, Addend., p. 172 : cf. Collins' *Defence*, p. 29. The same volume contains many particulars of these butcheries ; see also Sharp's *Mem. of the Rebellion* : as e.g. p. 163, where Bowes boasts that above six hundred had been executed, "so that the authors of this rebellion be cursed on every side." Bowes claimed their goods, as Gargrave, the Attorney-General, who was at York, remarked : "Mr. Bowes, as Marshal, claims their goods, and I claim them for the Queen, because it is a case of war."—*Cal. Dom.*, Add., p. 221.

\* "Being a private person, I have forborne to trouble you, but am now compelled by conscience. The people are in a mad desperation, many secret mutinies among them : their daily talk in many places is of the rebels' return, which is rather wished after than detested. The commons are very wanton : and though many have suffered, yet very few or none of the gentlemen who are the incentors to all this evil have tasted of judgment."—*Cal. Dom.*, Addend., p. 223. The order for execution was sent by Sussex to Bowes, January 10. It is a fearful order. Under the list of those who joined the rebels in every town and village Sussex wrote the number to be executed. A general sum for each wapentake is given as follows :—

Joined in Gilling West . . .	141	To be executed . . .	30
„ in Hang East . . .	241	„ „ . . .	42
„ in Hang West . . .	293	„ „ . . .	47
„ in Halykeld . . .	341	„ „ . . .	57
„ in Gilling East . . .	225	„ „ . . .	37

The list concludes with the following summary :—

The total number which joined themselves with the rebels	
within the liberties of Richmond and Richmondshire	1241
The total number appointed to be executed . . . . .	213
Serving men appointed to be executed in Richmondshire .	18
The total number appointed to be executed in Richmond-	
shire . . . . .	231

—Sharp's *Memorials of the Rebellion*, p. 143.



to be. But at first there was a difficulty which demanded a little ingenuity. It came up that, as most of the forfeited estates lay in the bishopric, they would go to the see and not to the Crown, which was intolerable. "Compound with the Bishop for his royalties," said Lord Sussex disdainfully, "or translate him, and in the vacancy all will grow to her Majesty." But this would have been too audacious: it was better simply to proceed as if there were no such claim or right in existence. All seemed going well when the Bishop, as Prince Palatine, sued the Queen for restitution. An engine had to be used at last: it was an Act passed by the ensuing Parliament to vest the forfeitures in the Crown *pro hac vice*.\* For warning to the south of the kingdom, two of the Nortons, old Thomas and his nephew Christopher, were carried to London, put in the Tower, and hanged at Tyburn: where they showed in what manner brave and simple Englishmen can die.†

\* Froude, ix. 565; Pilkington's *Works*, Park. Soc., p. ix.

† They were drawn from the Tower to Tyburn, May 27, "a godly preacher riding beside them, always comforting and exhorting them to acknowledge their fault, discharge their conscience, and be truly repentant." Old Norton, standing on the cart with the rope round his neck, answered that "for the offence against the Queen, he had the law for it, and must suffer death." The preacher requested him to say the Lord's Prayer; he began it in Latin: and being desired to say it in the vulgar tongue, that all might bear witness that he died a true Christian, he murmured obstinately that he would pray in Latin, and therefore prayed him not to molest his conscience. The Secondary of the Tower bade him say it to himself if he would say it in Latin: and so he did. Then the preacher besought him to say it in English, and also the Belief, like a true Christian. After much exhortation he complied, and added the Ave Maria. He then desired "not only the audience, but also all the saints in heaven to pray for him, both then and at all times, as well after his death as then he being alive." The preacher bade him "put his whole hope and trust in the blood-shedding of Christ our Saviour, and by Him only hope to be saved." With that the cart was drawn away. Christopher his nephew, accepted the exhortations of the preacher unreservedly; called on the people to repeat the Lord's Prayer with him: and made a solemn

If by the civil law rebellion met with death and ruin, the spiritual offences contracted in the same exigency were easily expiated by penitence and confession in the ecclesiastical court of the bishopric. In the city of Durham eighty persons are said to have been hanged by process of civil law. More than a hundred, some of them women, were examined by Doctor Swift, the Vicar-General, and another Commissary, in the Galilee of Durham, and released on putting their name or sign to an acknowledgment of guilt and sorrow, and performing, it is likely, the penance of reading or hearing it read in public. They were of various rank; priests, choristers, tradesmen, mechanics; they had been mixed up, or had taken part, in the disorders committed in the minster and the neighbouring churches during the brief ascendancy of the rebels. By a happy chance the proceedings against them, the libels or charges, together with their personal answers, which have been preserved, shed a keen, if narrow, ray over part of a dark and stormy field. The libels that were drawn up by the court were four or five in number: intended to include every examinee under one or other of them: against hearers of Mass, against erecters of altars and holy-water vats, against burners of church books, against those who pleaded that they had been sufficiently corrected by the Dean of Durham, whose previous intervention, it seems, was not tolerable to the court. These libels advanced the same principles: that no

confession of his "heinous offence committed between God and his prince," praying for mercy "on me, miserable and wretched sinner, who am now coming to Thee, being here now ready to die." The hangman hanged him a little, and he was cut down, and "the butcher opened him," on which he cried, "O Lord, Lord, have mercy upon me," and expired.—From the "Several Confessions," printed by Wm. How for Rd. Jones, 1570, in Cobbett's *State Trials*, p. 1083.

other service than the Book of Common Prayer was to be used, that the Mass and Latin Service were justly abolished, that altars ought to be taken down, that the Bible and other church books ought to be kept in all churches. These powerful premisses were acknowledged by the examimates in their personal answers, who then added that nevertheless they had broken one or other of them. Thus, George Cliff, one of the prebendaries and a former monk, said that it was very true that the English Service ought to be used and the Latin Mass abolished, but nevertheless he was in the cathedral church on St. Andrew's Day, November 30, and heard Robert Pearson sing Mass at the high altar; but that he himself sang not, nor looked at the elevation, nor bowed, nor knocked, nor kneeled, nor used any other open fact or reverence, but sat still in his stall. William Blenkinsop, a minor canon, knew that the English Service was to be used and the Latin Service was abolished, for he had read the Act of Parliament; but still on the day when Pearson sang the Mass he was there, and some days after that, when the Earl of Northumberland came, he was there, and heard William Holms preach a sermon in the same cathedral church, speaking expressly against the state of religion established by the laws of the realm and commending the service now abolished; and when Holms after the sermon announced that he had authority to reconcile men to the Church of Rome, and bade those who would be reconciled kneel down, he confessed that he was of the sort that knelt down, while Holms pronounced a form of absolution in Latin in the name of Christ and Pope Pius of Rome;\* and further he was sorry to say that he and four other minor canons, under the persuasion and threats of

\* See the *Forma absolutionis* above, note, p. 221.



Sir John Pearson, went to Staindrop to Holms and professed themselves to the state called catholical, and not that called schismatical; whereupon Holms admitted them as deacons to minister in the church, but not to celebrate: and that he had since sung and helped service, and gone in procession after the cross twice or thrice within the cathedral church. William Watson, chaplain of St. Mary Magdalen, knew the premisses certainly so to be; was at Holms's sermon, but could not get near for the throng or press of people, and when the people kneeled down, he took it for a prayer, not any absolution from the Pope, which he heard afterwards that it was. John Brimley, the cathedral choirmaster, an excellent musician, believed the premisses, but had heard a piece of Holms's sermon, had kneeled to be reconciled, and had played the organ at several Masses and at matins and evensong, being required by the priests, but sang not himself at them.\*

A number of the lay clerks gave similar answers: none of them could tell anything about the books that had been carried off. William Gibson, a surgeon, churchwarden of St. Giles, acknowledged that churchwardens ought to provide a Bible, a Book of Common Prayer, and other church books; but was sorry that he and his fellow warden, a labourer who could not write, had burned the Book of Common Prayer, the *Apology* of Bishop Jewell, a Book of Homilies, and other books, and had set up the high altar again: after hearing that the like had been done in the churches of St. Nicholas and St. Oswald. The churchwardens of St. Oswald, a tinker and a tailor, both illiterate, confessed that it was so: that they had set up the altar there, and

\* John Brimley was buried in the beautiful cathedral Galilee, with an epitaph, still remaining, in verse, extolling his music.

burned the Bible, the Common Prayer, the *Apology*, and the Homilies, at the bridge end. So of other places: Pittington, Bishop Auckland, Sedgefield, and many other parishes. The havoc of the English books was far greater than can be gathered from the histories.\*

The insurrection, as it subsided in Northumberland and Durham, rose again in Cumberland; and it was there that the only considerable struggle took place. While the Earls were still in arms, their secret confederate, the adventurous Leonard Dacre, was at Court, endeavouring to secure to himself the vast estates of his family about Gilsland. A second son, he had seen, not without a gleam of ambitious hope, the premature decease of his elder brother Thomas, followed by the accidental death of George his youthful nephew, the next heir: but only to find standing between him and the family honours George's three sisters, among whom by law a partition of the barony was attendant. He claimed it as heir in tail male, while the Duke of Norfolk, guardian of the three nieces, proceeded in Chancery to establish the rights of his wards. Perceiving that the law was not likely to favour his claim, Leonard suddenly asked permission to return to the north, and to be entrusted with a share in the work of suppressing the rebellion.† Arriving about the

\* There is a great deal about the conflagration of books at Sedgefield, which the churchwarden burnt on the green by the cross, stirring them with a stick and remarking, as the flame shot up, "Lo where the Homilies flees to the devil": or, according to another witness, "See the devil domines flee into the allyment." These excellent materials are contained in vol. 21 of the Surtees Society's *Depositions and Ecclesiastical Proceedings in the Courts of Durham*, edited by the late Canon Raine.

† "Her Majesty was content, upon suit made by Leonard Dacre (notwithstanding she had heard that he had been the summer before secretly conversant with the Earls), to admit him at Windsor to her presence. Where, being privately with her, he made offers of his service against the

time of the flight of the Earls to Hexham, he flung off the mask of loyalty, took the style of lord, seized Naworth Castle, which he fortified,\* fired the beacons, and raised at once three or four thousand men under the scallop shell of the Dacres, in the desperate hope of winning the patrimony by causing the rebellion to succeed. His case was soon decided. Henry Carey, Lord Hunsdon, cousin german of the Queen, at the head of fifteen hundred trained "shot," or arquebusiers and horse, marched rapidly from Berwick, and found him posted for battle at Hall Beck, a little stream that runs into the Gelt a mile from Gilsland, on a ravine where the land rises on the northern side above the river valley. There, almost in sight of the Roman Wall, the greatest military monument of antiquity in the world, then but little impaired, ruined within the last hundred and fifty years,† was fought a battle that was more worthy of a public than a private war. At a point skilfully chosen, where the cliff falls steep to the stream, Dacre fiercely charged his advancing foe. "His footmen," said Hunsdon, "delivered the proudest charge upon my shot that ever I saw." But the

said Earls," &c. Proclamation against Dacre.—Strype, *Annals*, i. 592. The proclamations that were issued by both sides are given by Strype, and contain many of the facts presented in the histories. Dacre was much implicated with the Scottish Queen. See *Exam. of the Bp. of Ross*, in Murdin.

\* "Naworth is kept by him with great force, and guns are laid in every corner of the house, and he is getting victuals, and preparing for a whole year. He is called in the house Lord Dacre, and I asked about it at Carlisle, but it is unknown there." Dayman to Sir John Forster.—*Cal. Dom.*, Addenda, p. 219.

† I may be excused for this observation. The destruction of the Roman Wall has now been stopped, almost too late, by the unaided intervention of antiquaries. It was proceeding frightfully within living memory. An old farmer in my former parish of Hayton, a friend of mine, boasted that "he had carted many a load of stones from the Roman Wall" to build byres and pigsties! Camden remarks upon the nearness of "the Picts' Wall" to the scene of action.



borderers, who were mostly archers, could not long withstand the fire of the arquebuses: Hunsdon dashed upon them with his horse, and flung them into confusion with heavy loss.\* Dacre fled from the field, escaped into Scotland, thence into Flanders, and died in a year or two, in great misery and poverty, at Louvain.† For the rest, the northern rebellion did

\* The Venetian ambassador at Paris reported that each side lost 400 men, which was a high proportion of the number engaged.—*Ven. Cal.*, p. 455. But Hunsdon only mentions that his enemy lost three or four hundred. The battle was hardly prolonged enough for heavy loss on his part. Dacre had persuaded his followers that he only contended for his own title: and Hunsdon informed the Council of this, to prevent another horrible revenge. "I never heard any man so cried out upon and cursed, both of men, women, and children, as Leonard Dacre: all affirm that he persuaded them that it was only for the maintenance of his title, and to keep the possession which otherwise would be taken from him by force. If her Majesty would send down a commission to execute some few principal bailiffs and constables, it should suffice: because the slaughter was so great, being above 400, besides many who went away with deadly wounds, whereof they die daily—and then a general pardon be given. I cannot hear of any gentleman with them."—*Cal. Dom.*, Addend., p. 244.

† Dacre's conduct in the field has been variously related. According to Hunsdon himself, he "was the first man that fled, and never looked behind him till he was in Liddisdale."—*Cal. Dom.*, Addenda, p. 241. Cp. Froude. Baker says, "Though he were crook-backed, he behaved himself valiantly" (*Chron.* p. 344); Lingard, "He displayed the courage of a warrior and the abilities of a leader." In this he follows Camden. Dacre, in fact, and Hunsdon also, were in the thick of it. This little campaign offers some points of interest. Dacre was to have been crushed by the united forces of Lord Scrope from Carlisle and Hunsdon from Berwick. As Scrope was only ten miles from Naworth, Hunsdon thought he might have finished the business alone, and started unwillingly on his march of eighty miles from Berwick. But the bulk of Scrope's forces had to be brought up from Kendal, forty miles south: he had no artillery for a siege, nor had Hunsdon. The latter, as he advanced, was challenged, in the style of chivalry, by Dacre to fight, more than once. Dacre desired to dispose of him before Scrope could unite with him. On the other hand, Hunsdon's continued advance, when he passed Naworth Castle without attempting to invest it, contrary to the usual strategy of the age, and headed straight for Carlisle to join Scrope, compelled Dacre to attack him before he had got all his own men together. As soon as the battle was over, Hunsdon came across a body of fifteen hundred men hurrying

two things. It added to the number of declarations of Uniformity, and it added to the formularies of the Church of England. In the months of the rebellion, November and December, all justices of the peace throughout England were required to subscribe their names to a declaration of obedience and conformity: to the great annoyance of many of them who were Romanensians.\* The Second Book of Homilies was adorned and completed by the sixfold Homily against Rebellion, composed by Parker and some of his learned chaplains upon this occasion. It contains some passages in which the character, designs, and

down to share in the fighting. Of the fight itself, Hunsdon's account is very clear. "Yesterday I went from Hexham towards Naworth, and by marching all night came before Naworth by daylight: the beacons burned all night, and every hill was full of horse and foot, crying and shouting as if they had been mad. As his house was full of ordnance, men, and munitions, I determined to march to Carlisle, and there join Lord Scrope: but Dacre's force was such as he made full account of both me and mine: and so sent me word, and offered to skirmish in sundry places, which I forbade. When he had followed me four miles from his house, in a heath where we were to pass a river, his foot gave the proudest charge upon my shot that ever I saw; whereupon, having left Sir John Forster with 500 horse for my back, I charged with the rest of my horse upon his foot, and slew between 300 and 400, and have taken 200 or 300 prisoners. Leonard Dacre was the first man that fled, &c.; one of my company had him by the arm, and if he had not been rescued by certain Scots, whereof he had many, he had been taken. They were above 3,000, whereof 1,000 were horsed, while I had not 1,500 of all sorts." To the Queen, Feb. 20, Carlisle.—*Cal. Dom.*, Addenda, p. 241.

\* Letters were sent by the Council to the sheriffs of the counties, and to some of the bishops and other chief men, that all justices of the peace should subscribe to an instrument professing their obedience to the Act for Uniformity and due resort to the parish churches. They promised that they and their families would "duly and devoutly hear and take part in the Common Prayers and all other divine service, and also receive the holy Sacrament from time to time, according to the tenor of the said Act of Parliament": and that they would neither say or do, nor suffer anything to be said or done, "in contempt or reproof of any part of religion established by the aforesaid Act." This specimen is given by Strype, ii. 346. A large number of these instruments, or declarations, are in the Record Office.—*Cal. Dom. Eliz.*, pp. 346-357.

doings of these particular rebels are depicted with power and frankness.\*

In October, 1568, Parker signified to Cecil and the Queen that the new translation of the Bible, on which he, with other bishops and doctors, had been engaged for several years, was finished and had passed the press. It was the version commonly known as the Bishops' Bible. It was a stately folio. Eleven bishops, besides the Primate, had laboured on it, and several doctors; such number met not on such an enterprise since, under Cranmer, in 1542, the bishops and clergy unsuccessfully attempted the like.† One prelate who had been concerned in the former undertaking survived to take part in this: the past and the present lived in Barlow. The rest were Alley, Davies, Sandys, Parkhurst, Horne, Bentham, Grindal, Scambler, Cox, Bullingham, a learned bench; Dean Goodman of Westminster, Dean Perne of Ely; and Doctor Andrew Pierson.‡ To them on their appointment the Primate delivered some excellent rules for guidance, or "Observations required of the translators." They were to follow "the common

\* The Homily against Rebellion, with the appended form of Thanksgiving for the defeat of this rebellion, was at first published separately: but almost immediately added to the second tome of Homilies. Grindal, in his Injunctions for the Province of York, in 1571, ordered that there should be provided in every church "the two tomes of the Homilies, with the Homilies lately written against Rebellion."—*Remains*, p. 133. See Collins' *Queen Elizabeth's Defence*, p. 31, where other particulars are given. It may be remarked that in Alnwick the Book of Homilies which was then provided, containing the Rebellion and the Thanksgiving, still stands chained on a metal frame or lectern in the parish church, a few hundred yards from the gate of Alnwick Castle, at the other end of Bailliffgate. And in Bailliffgate, between the church and the castle, is the little modern Roman Catholic chapel in which, a few years ago, the rebellious Earl Thomas was ceremoniously beatified.

† Vol. ii. p. 285 of this work.

‡ Parker's *Correspondence*, p. 335.



English translation used in the churches," and not needlessly recede from it, meaning the Great Bible, or Bible of Crumwel and Cranmer. They were "to make no bitter notes on any text, or yet set down any determination in places of controversy." They were to mark with some stroke or note such places as were not for the edifying of the congregation, "that the reader might eschew them in his public reading." The success of the book was not equal to the pains bestowed on it. Though several editions, revised or recognized, were issued, it never got into general use. It was generous in the English Primate, who had preferred the Geneva Bible with its venomous annotations to any lack of the word of God, to forbid controversial bitterness in his own volume; but bitterness sells well, and the Geneva Bible kept the market. But the Bishops' Bible had notes, though not bitter notes, and disquisitions and headings of chapters. Like all preceding versions of the Bible, of whatever origin, of the sixteenth century, it was both a rendering and a commentary. The insane principle that the Bible is best without an interpreter, and can be used in education without explanation, was not invented before the age in which we live.

## CHAPTER XL.

A.D. 1570.

THE election of Pius the Fifth, which befel in the beginning of 1566, silenced an eloquent preacher, and raised to the summit a friar of obscure birth, reverend holiness, and visionary mind. His nature, quick and hot, was prone to ebullition: but the gust that is unfed by worldly pride and malice passes easily and quickly: and it was the authoritative severity of the Pope, into which his admirable virtues were condensed, that rendered him fanatic and dangerous to the peace of Christendom. The favourite of the furious Paul the Fourth, created cardinal by him, and constituted Commissary of the Inquisition in which Paul misspent so many of his hours, the tradition of his education answered to his natural bent. He began by essaying to reform the society of Rome, a sufficient task for any Roman bishop. But anon he was treading the steps of his predecessors in popedom, exerting the temporal power, fighting and intriguing among the kings of the earth. He sent an army to aid Charles the Ninth of France; he gave licence to sell and alienate church lands in France to carry on the war against the Huguenots. He excommunicated Elizabeth of England.

It appears that the juridical Process upon which the Queen of England was cast of heresy in the Apostolic Chamber was later than the Bull by which she was

pronounced heretic. The Process was merely meant to herald the Bull, which had been composed previously; that it might be possible to say to the Christian world that not without course of law, not without cognizance, or upon a cause insufficiently perused, was so extreme a measure taken. Nevertheless, though what should have been first was last, the Process, which is extant, deserves consideration. Itself is curious, the spectacle of an English sovereign arraigned in the Pope's Court: and some of the particulars may amuse or instruct the reader. In the month of December, 1569, the proceedings against Elizabeth seem to have been opened. They were continued in several sessions in the following February in the judicial palace of the Curia before Alexander Riarius, the General Auditor of Causes. Twelve witnesses, all English exiles, appeared against their Queen; and, according to the promise of the Process that they should,\* gave answers to the following Articles to be enquired: Whether the Queen of England had usurped the authority of Head of the Church; whether she had deprived, whether she had imprisoned, bishops and other ecclesiastics; whether she had made visitations on her own authority, required any oath, made any laws against the Holy See; whether any schismatics, not being priests, had been made bishops or rectors by her authority; whether by her authority any manifest and damned heresies were preached; whether she had the Supper of the Lord after the manner of heretics; whether she acknowledged and received the Eucharist, like the Catholics, or had the Supper, as the heretics; whether she lived like a heretic, not hearing Mass and the other

\* "Articuli infrascripti probabuntur per duodecim testes, et plures." The Process is given "totidem verbis" by Raynaldus and Laderchius, *Ann. Eccles.*, sub anno 1570, p. 153 (edit. 1880).



divine offices after the Catholic manner, but contrarily after the heretic manner ; whether she observed choice of meats ; what heresy in particular she professed, Calvinistic, Lutheran, or other ; whether she frequented or permitted heretical preachings ; whether, if she could, she would not extirpate heretical preachings, like her sister Mary ; or could her Parliament or her Council intervene to prevent her ; whether her Parliament or her Council contained heretics, and were, or were not, moveable at her will. Another schedule contained only the first nine of these eighteen interrogatories, adding two new ones : Whether any by her authority had been fined or imprisoned for attending Mass ; whether she denied any of the seven Sacraments. At the end of the Articles were the names of the twelve witnesses.

The first was Richard Shelley, former Prior of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem in Highbury, who deposed, February 5, that he knew the Queen, and had known her before she was queen ; that her name was Elizabeth, believed to be the daughter of Henry the Eighth and Queen Anne Boleyn ; that he left her kingdom in 1559 in anticipation of a law against the authority of the Holy See, and a blasphemous Oath therein contained. He put in a copy of the Oath in Italian, a letter of the Spanish ambassador, Guzman, to the effect that things were bad enough in England, a letter from his brother, Thomas Shelley, who had gone to Louvain rather than obey the pseudopiscopi, and a letter from his nephew, Thomas Copple, a rich gentleman of Surrey, who had been greatly troubled by the royal Visitation, the Oath, and other requirements. Thomas Goldwell, the deprived Bishop of St. Asaph, deposed, February 6, that the Queen was the daughter of Henry the Eighth ; that he left England

because she had despoiled all the bishops there, and because he would not officiate, or minister, or preach, or enter into recognizances not to leave the kingdom, as other bishops had done. He said that he knew of her doings, which were notorious, and he was informed about her laws and ordinances by friends in St. Asaph, but he had never read them, nor desired to see or read them, as inconsistent with the Catholic faith and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. She had deprived all persons who would not subscribe that she was governor of a particular Church, and cast them into prison, where some had died. She had intruded a deformation of religion contrary to the rules and precepts of Holy Mother Church. "And she substituted in the room of Catholics, whether alive or dead, heretics who were no priests. I myself had two successors, married men and fathers, in my see." As to manifest and damned heresies, "Most certainly; many are preached in sermons, especially as to the Sacraments. Confirmation, Order, Extreme Unction, Matrimony are called papistical Sacraments: Confirmation is forbidden as well as the Mass. That the Queen has the Supper of the Lord in the heretic manner, is plain from the relation of all who make their way hither. They have what they call the Lord's Supper on a wooden table, which is far from being a portable altar: the partakers on one side receive each a piece of bread, on the other side they take the wine.\* It is preached publicly, and the Queen asserts, that Catholics are erroneous in the Lord's Supper, particularly in that we hold that the substances of bread and wine remain not."

\* "Ego scio quod ipsa Cœnam quandam facit, quam Cœnam Dominicam vocant, super ligneam tabulam, absque ullo altari portabili, et illi qui communionem percipiunt ex uno tabulæ latere, singuli panis buccellam recipiunt, ex altero vero latere vinum sumunt."

Maurice Clenock, a clergyman of Canterbury, whom the Pope seems to have nominated to the see of Bangor,\* deposed that he knew from relation that bishops and others had been imprisoned. Doctor Nicolas Morton the Penitentiary, formerly of York, recently returned from England, deposed that he had been deprived of his benefices, and had taken flight to avoid the Oath. As to schismatics, not being priests, consecrated bishops and rectors, he said that there was not a bishop or a rector to be found who was not a schismatic; and that all were created and promoted by the Queen's authority, meaning without the Pope's authority: "and I know moreover that there are bishops who are mere laymen and have wives. He of Lincoln is such an one; he has a wife to my knowledge, the daughter of a nobleman of that part, whose name I forget. It is notorious there: but after six years I cannot give the names of individuals, bishops or other, schismatics, or men that are no priests."† He seems to have considered a married priest to be no priest, and to have understood the question so, although there was nothing about marriage of priests in the question. All the other witnesses seem to have thought that the question must mean that. "With regard to the Lord's Supper," continued Morton, "I know that the Queen and her Parliament have concocted a Book in the English tongue called *Of the*

\* He is styled in the Process "nominatus Episcopus Asaphensis." Bridgewater in his *Concertatio Eccl. Cath.* calls him "Episcopus designatus" (index).

† "Et scio insuper aliquos episcopos esse, qui mere laici sunt et uxorem habent; quos inter est Linconensis, quem scio uxorem habere, filiam nobilis cujusdam ejusdemmet regionis, cujus nomen non memini: et id illis in regionibus factum notorium est: sed quia jam sex anni elapsi sunt, ex quo inde decessi, nomina singulorum, tam episcoporum, quam aliorum, tam schismaticorum, quam non sacerdotum, recitare non valeo, nisi ut explicavi, et verum est."



*Supper of the Lord.* I have seen and read that book. In it there is no consecration in the Catholic form, or anything resembling consecration, for the words are not used which the Roman Catholic Church uses. This is all I can say on that head. As to the other interrogatories, I have to say that in that kingdom they have neither Confirmation, nor private Confession, nor Order, nor Extreme Unction. I have been there. I have seen and know that they have none of these Sacraments. The nobles of the country told me so. It is notorious. It is the truth." Henry Henshaw, the deprived Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford, who had left England eight years before, and after a year in Belgium had betaken himself to Rome, deposed, February 7, that he had seen a law or Act forbidding any to exercise authority without Elizabeth Boleyn; that he had spoken with many who had been deprived by her commissaries; that he had been deprived himself on her authority, and he could only believe that so had others; that in fact there was her little seal on the mandate summoning him to appear before the commissaries: and the same had been done to thirteen other *presidents* of Lincoln College. On imprisoning of bishops, he said he had conversed with the deprived of London, Ely, Lincoln, Bath, Lichfield, Worcester, Chester, Peterborough; and had seen them all constituted in jails except Peterborough, and had talked with them in their jails. As to schismatics who were no priests, made bishops and rectors, he had not seen the Queen's decree appointing them, but he knew they had been created by her authority, and that many of them had wives. Edmond Daniel, late Dean of Hereford, deposed upon the question about them that were no priests, that he knew the successors of the Catholics to be schismatics and heretics, no priests,

and some of them married. He related his own deprivation on the Visitation of the Queen's Commissioners: and his refusal to celebrate in the Queen's chapel without the ceremony of elevation of the Host.\* Doctor Edward Brombrough, late a scholar of Oxford, and a rector in Winchester diocese, deposed that all the bishops in England but one had been deposed, that heretics had been substituted for the deprived Catholics, but whether any of them were no priests he could not say. Certainly they were heretics, for he had heard some of them preaching heresies. He had heard London and Sarum; and they preached against the authority of the Holy See, against the Mass, indulgences, purgatory, and many other such like things. William Alott, a layman of Lincoln, deposed, February 9, that Bishop Bullingham was his intimate friend, and that he knew that he was not a priest, rather that he was a desperate heretic, who had his place by the Queen's authority, and was ready to do whatever she should order, a thing in itself contrary to the authority of the Holy See: that he had spoken to him once since he had taken the style of bishop; that it was plain that he was a heretic because he had taken the room of a Catholic bishop on the Queen's authority.† Interrogated whether the Queen could

\* See above, p. 168.

† "Ego agnosco eum qui Linconiensis episcopus vocatur, nomine Nicolaum Bolingian, qui mihi amicitia junctus erat, et familiariter cum eo usus sum: et scio ipsum *non esse sacerdotem*, imo hereticissimum, et locum illum reginæ auctoritate occupavit. Qui episcopus prompto animo quidquid regina jubet exequitur, quod quidem, ut apparet, contra Sedis Apostolicæ auctoritatem est. Semet ipsum allocutus sum, ex quo episcopi nomenclationem accepit: uti tamen episcopus ab omnibus habetur: et tunc etiam hereticus agnoscitur, quod episcopi Catholici locum ex reginæ auctoritate occupat." Great stress is laid on the question about being no priests; and the answers that seem to favour it are put in italics by the zeal of Raynaldus.

stop heretical preaching if she would, like her sister Mary; and whether she could be obstructed in so doing by Parliament or Council, he answered that if the Queen gave the slightest sign of willing to live like a Catholic, it would be done at once: for that more in England desired the Catholic faith and life than not: that he had heard Mass in Lord Morley's house and in Lord Arcton's, not once but a dozen times: that they celebrated it daily: so also in other noble houses, and at a certain merchant's. Doctor Richard Hall of York deposed that he had seen a law in which the Queen styled herself supreme governor, and when he had read those words he read no further; in which law the Mass was forbidden,\* and the Christian way of life prohibited. He had seen also in another book which he had read, or partly heard read, that a different order of worship from the Catholic was sought: in consecrating the elements the order was inverted: a narrative of the institution of the Supper of the Lord was rehearsed, nothing more, and this was called the Communion.† The Queen lived the life of a heretic, and never heard Mass and the other divine offices in the Catholic form. He said that he had heard the keeping of Lent treated in a sermon, in the palace, before the Queen, by the pretended Bishop of Salisbury, as a voluntary ceremony, of which the only obligation was the Queen's law permitting fish to be eaten, that lambs might grow. The Queen could do as she pleased without hindrance; Parliament and Council were mostly heretics. The pretended bishops were heretics; it was notorious that they

\* "Missæ Sacramenta prohibebantur."

† "Docebatur a Catholico diversus ordo, et faciendæ consecrationis ordo invertebatur: sed tantum Dominicæ Cœnæ historia recitabatur, et hæc Communio vocabatur."



were created without the authority of the High Pontiff. Richard Shelley, a former Fellow of New College, Oxford, deposed, February 10, as to bishops that were no priests, that he knew one Jewel, who came from Geneva, who was held to be a heretic, made Bishop of Salisbury instead of a Catholic, and this was said to be by the Queen's authority : he had seen that man in Oxford. And he had seen another heretic made Bishop of Winchester : and there were others. The Queen could do what she would, Parliament and Council could not stay her ; Cecil, Bacon, and Bedford were the leaders of the heretics. Henry Kirton, Bachelor of Laws, deposed that he had seen bishops and doctors deprived and put in the Tower : such were the Bishops of York and Ely, and Doctors Cole and Boxal : \* that two notoriously married doctors, Young and Cox, had succeeded those two bishops : that the heresy of the Queen was rather Calvinian than Lutheran ; she could do what she would ; that neither Parliament nor Council could stop her. Thomas Kirton, priest, of Salisbury, deposed, upon bishops no priests, that he knew Jewel, a very celebrated heretic, extremely well, having been educated with him in the same house "in Anstruica" : † and that he had been made Bishop of Salisbury, as he well knew, having spoken with him since his advancement : and that it was the public voice that some others had been made bishops by the Queen's authority who were no priests and were heretics : as was also the Bishop of Lincoln. The Queen could do what she would ; and so on. The heretic leaders were Cecil, Bacon, and Knowles ; some of them had been at Geneva or at Basle.

\* Absil is the word. These depositions make wild work of the English proper names. They are undoubtedly genuine, and were taken down by the notary from the lips of the deponents, each of whom afterwards signed his own deposition.

† Perhaps Ilfracombe.

Such was the evidence adduced in support of the Act of Recusation. The great part of it was notorious, or rather historical : some of it was inaccurate;\* a good deal was not direct, but inferential from some papistical premiss. The only new thing that appeared in the shape of a fact, and not of an argument, was that Bishop Bullingham was affirmed, by one who said he knew him well, never to have been ordained to the priesthood. The laborious annalists, who have continued Baronius and published this evidence to the world, struck by the tenuity of it in point of fact, have recalled three of the weakest of the witnesses, to show that after all there was more in them than might be thought upon the important article of bishops and rectors that were no priests : but the zeal of Raynaldus and Laderchius serves rather to display the secondary nature of the whole of the evidence than the special defaults of any part of it. "Come back," they cry, "Clenock, Brombrough, and Henshaw. You say that you saw not, you are not sure, you had been long out of England, and cannot tell whether any were made bishops or rectors who were no priests. But still you intimate surely, and it may be gathered from you, that there were who were made bishops or rectors who were no priests, rather than the contrary. For you say that

\* For instance, that was called Supreme Head: "Supremi Capituli locum usurpans." The expression was rather vague: but it may be presumed to have intended a definite accusation, used in such an indictment. The expression is found repeated in several writers of the time, evidently from the Bull itself; and there was (and still is with some) a belief that Elizabeth was Supreme Head. Gabutius gives a list of her iniquities very like the Bull: among them "ipsam Supremi Capituli locum usurpasse." *Vita Pii* v. p. 103. Bridgewater the same (*Concertatio*, p. 41): and Jewel indignantly exclaims, "Supremi Capituli locum usurpans! Where is she ever called the Supreme Head? Peruse the Acts of Parliament, the records, the rolls, and the writs of Chancery or Exchequer which pass in her Grace's name. Where is she ever called the Supreme Head of the Church?"—View of the Bull, *Works*, 1144.

Elizabeth's heresy was Calvinian, from which heresy the Sacrament of Order was specially eliminated: you say that they were married, and who knows not that in the Catholic manner of speaking to say that they were married is to say that they were laymen?" It may be that this opinion about bishops or rectors who were no priests arose out of Parker's unfortunate device of readers.\* The anxious advocates go on to make all the witnesses alike say in effect that whether Elizabeth's bishops had been ordained priests or not, they were no bishops, inasmuch as there were no bishops left in England to consecrate them. They bring in Parker's consecration; then call Elizabeth's bishops Parliamentary bishops, or say that they were so called, alleging the misinterpreted Act of 1566, and even denying that they were consecrated at all.† But all this is of their own superfluity: they apply to an earlier date the Roman legend of England as it existed full blown in their own age. For it is sufficiently remarkable that the proceedings which we are con-

\* Raynaldus and Laderchius quote Camden, under 1559, saying, "Now there being a very great dearth of learned men, several mechanics, men of the same level for sense and learning with the Romish priests, made a shift to work themselves into ecclesiastical promotions, and to compass good prebends and fat benefices." But Camden says not that these men were not ordained priests. It is not perhaps unamusing to notice the manner in which they quote him. "Multi ex officina mechanici et non minus illiterati, etc., dignitates Ecclesiasticas, præbendas et optima beneficia consecuti sunt" (p. 167).

† "Sanderus refert, cum nullus eos Catholicorum episcoporum consecrare voluisset, ex Parlamenti decreto jussum fuisse ut absque consecratione episcopalia munera exercere possent: unde hoc pacto electi, *episcopi parlamentarii* nuncupati sunt" (p. 165). This rather improves on Sanders, whose words see above, near end of chap. xxxviii *huj. op.* Sanders was first published in 1585. Raynaldus and Laderchius, in the eighteenth century, take this occasion of delivering a fierce attack on Le Courayer. "Improbi insipientissimique scriptoris illius temeritas!"—"Janseniana arte."—"Videat Processum hunc juridice instructum vir insipiens et linguosus et confundatur," &c.



sidering enter not at all into that region of the controversy. Neither the process nor the depositions, nor the Papal sentence founded thereon, make any mention of Parker's consecration or of Parliamentary bishops.

Upon the conclusion of the evidence, the Pope pronounced his "declaratory and condemnatory sentence" against the Queen. "The English people have risen against the Catholic faith, and live as heretics. Queen Mary by her utmost endeavours extirpated these sects and damned heresies, and through her industry the English were converted to the faith, and to due obedience to the Holy See and the High Pontiff. Elizabeth had but to follow her steps. But instead of that, this pretended queen, instigated by the devil, to our great annoyance, this daughter of iniquity, has set up her horns against the Apostolic jurisdiction with an Oath, a title, and a persecution, with deprivation, spoliation and usurpation, with laws and books heretical, with pestiferous example, scandal Calvinian, and anomaly monstrous, to the notorious and inexcusable contempt and outrage of the Holy See. All this has been proved by juridical process. We therefore give sentence, we declare, and decree that this alleged Queen of England has incurred the anathema of the greater excommunication, and the other pains and penalties of those who dare such deeds: \* we disable and deprive her of her kingdom. We excommunicate, anathematise, deprive, and disable her: we summon all faithful Christians, and issue letters accordingly: we absolve her people from their

\* Camden has remarked that the excommunication was pronounced without any previous admonition or citation. Raynaldus and Laderchius answer that there are two kinds of excommunication: the one is *ferendum*, which requires previous admonition; the other is *latum*, which requires none, and to this Elizabeth was certainly obnoxious (p. 170). There is always some wonderful explanation or another.

allegiance: as for her Oath and her books, we extinguish them, and order every edition of them to be burned." \* The Bull itself, the Bull of deposition, the Bull *Regnans in excelsis*, followed without further delay, opened the full aspect of the modern Papacy, and drove a sword into the bosom of Christendom. The greatest part of Elizabeth's crimes have been rehearsed in considering the sentence upon her: the Bull, in repeating the crimes and the sentence, added the asylum of all heretics granted in England, and the admission of papal messengers refused.†

This Bull, though disappointing to the extravagant expectations of the Pontiff who fulminated it, was an event of vast moment. It is to be numbered among calamities in English history. It turned Romanensians into Roman Catholics. It filled those men of the old religion with dismay: it was framed to urge them into guilt and suffering. It put them between the Pope

\* February 12.—Raynaldus, p. 162. The *Sententia* is tragically incoherent and ungrammatical sometimes: like many of the official Roman documents of the age.

† February 25. The Bull is accessible in Latin in Sanders (p. 295), in Camden, in Burnet (v. 579, Pocock), in Raynaldus (169), in Wilkins (iv. 260), in Cardwell (*Doc. Annals*, i. 328), and in Mendham's *Life of Pius V.* English versions are given by Fuller and Collier, and in the English translation of Camden. There is an English version made from an Italian version in the *Venetian Calendar*, p. 448. The opening sentences may be quoted, as the perfect form of popery: "Regnans in excelsis, cui data est omnis in cœlo et in terra potestas, unam sanctam, Catholicam et Apostolicam Ecclesiam, extra quam nulla est salus, uni soli in terris, videlicet Apostolorum Principi Petro, Petrique successori Romano Pontifici, in potestatis plenitudine tradidit gubernandam. Hunc unum super omnes gentes et omnia regna Principem constituit, qui evellat, destruat, disperdat, plantet, et ædificet: ut fidelem populum mutue caritatis nexu constrictum in unitate spiritus contineat salvumque et incolumem suo exhibeat salvatori." As to the date of the Bull, it is given in the *Bullarium* and in some of the books as "5 Cal. Maii." It has been suggested that Maii is a misprint for Martii, as the *Bullarium* itself gives Feb. 25 in the margin. See the note in the *Ven. Cal.*, p. 451. "The fifth of the Calends of March" is the date given by Fuller; i.e. February 25. No doubt this is right.

and the Queen; between their own country and a foreign monarchy. They could not thenceforth hold to their own opinions without the suspicion of treason; or assert them without the liability of disaffection. The distant hand of relentless obstinacy seemed to have dashed down the balance of chances in which they had been hanging; to have closed ungratefully the leniency with which it had seemed good to treat them. They could no longer hope, remaining in the Church of England, for the restoration of some of the old worship or religion, to be attempted by constitutional means. The whole train of their religion, the whole doctrine therein embodied, was disparted from the former association in which they had held it; ceased to be native; flew away to the Capitol; and was managed from thence peremptorily thenceforth without the concurrence of English thought or learning, whilst it was transformed by reckless additions, and alienated more and more completely, as time went, from Scripture, from genuine antiquity, and from reason. The Bull, which alleged the schism of England, made a schism in England: the reluctant Romanensians found themselves compelled to sever themselves from their own Church; and in the act of schism to precede, it seems probable, those of the Nonconformists who were moving toward separation from the most contrary motives. The Roman Catholics were the first English schismatics. Immediately the weapons of an irreconcilable conflict, the munitions of an everlasting war, were prepared. England was to be treated as a heathen nation. A chain of forts was built over seas\*: from

\* The seminaries and colleges of Douay, Rheims, Rome, Seville, Valladolid, and St. Omers were founded in years after the Bull.—Tierney's *Dodd*, vol. ii. art. iii. Sanders gives an account of the "initia Seminariorum" in Flanders, at Rome, &c. (p. 291); Fuller gives a list of them (ii. 486).



which there sallied year by year an army of devoted scouts, pioneers, and champions to aid the Papal cause within the island. They were not, the most of them, men of much learning. The intrusion was called a mission. They, and they to whom they ministered, alone were held to possess Christianity. An ecclesiastical system was set up, in affront of the Church of England, having its root, derivation, and authority merely from the Pope. All defects in this organisation were covered by the robe of the dispensing or condoning power of the Sovereign Pontiff. As for the Romanensians, to be turned into Roman Catholics, and forced into another religious community, a new Church, was disastrous enough to them. They could not forget that they were Englishmen; and yet they were driven to choose between loyalty and religion. Nothing has made them forget that they were Englishmen from first to last; and yet they have been cut off to no inconsiderable extent from the national life of England, from that progress which depends for the breath of its being upon intellectual freedom. They were not allowed to forget the Church from which they were severed. A miserable series of penal laws, over which every good man must mourn, began to deface the statute book upon their account; the word Recusant began from this time to be particularly applied to them, and Recusancy began to be treated as a particular crime.\* The Bull was successful as a work

\* "And now began the word recusant to be first born and bred in men's mouths; which, though formerly in being to signify such as refused to obey the edicts of lawful authority, was now confined in common discourse to express those of the Church of Rome."—Fuller, ii. 497-8. Bishop Andrewes denies that the word was known with peculiar significance for the first ten years of the reign, or before the Bull: "Per aliquot lustra *Recusantem esse* quid sibi vellet, ignotum penitus; necdum enim nata hic apud nos vox ipsa, vel titulus *Recusantis* . . . proluviis illa quæ post fuit *Recusantium*

of vengeance: it infixed an annoyance that has survived its proper purpose. It was a notable piece of the Counter-reformation. If it was brute thunder, it was thunder. It was a characteristic event of the last part of that memorable century, of the time when the glory of letters, of humanity, was deserting Italy: when the profane Muses were flying before the face of a relentless, a repentant, purity, which turned from their pages to devastate their monuments; when holy rage arose, an indiscriminating spirit, a corruption of reason, a baseless enthusiasm, which clad the Papacy in impenetrable armour, and bade it grasp terrific weapons.

The Romanensian families in England, in perplexity and alarm, sought reasons for the most part to disregard the Bull. Was not this incredible parchment, they asked, a forgery, a device to render the Papacy odious? Should not a distinction be drawn between Papal policy and doctrine: and was not the excommunication of princes and of multitudes invalid? For the soundness of this denial they cited Aquinas.\* The document itself ought to be seen, they cried, if it demanded obedience. As it was not possible to see it, was there not sufficient ground for omitting to observe it? Who could tell whether it had been copied correctly? Had it been promulgated? If at all, had it been promulgated with the requisite solemnity? Was it properly attested? There is scholastic authority

ex Pii censura."—*Tortura Torti*, p. 130 (1609). The first official use of it, that I have observed, is in the postscript of the letter of the Council to Parker, of Nov. 6, 1569, where it is found with a qualifying addition, such as masks the beginning of the particular application of a word: "the recusants to come to church."—Wilkins, iv. 257; Parker's *Corresp.* 358.

\* "Others did question the lawfulness of all excommunications of princes, according to the rule of St. Thomas, *princeps et multitudo non est excommunicanda*."—Fuller, ii. 494. He gives most of the reasonings here described. Soames follows him.

for disobeying a call to rebellion and sedition.\* What can warrant interference with natural allegiance? They had been unmolested hitherto. Few of them but had conformed occasionally. Why should they awake persecution, and hazard their lives and goods, which were in the hand of the Queen?† In no nation under heaven, they exclaimed, has the subject been put to such distress: no people in Christendom has ever been treated as the Pope has treated England.‡

So argued the Romanensian laity and clergy who remained in England. They felt that they were thrown into danger by the more determined spirits who had left their country for the Pope's sake: that the Pope, ready enough of himself, had been impelled by the violence of these exiles, who were about him and his Court: that the case was reversed: and that at the instance of the Goldwells, the Sanderses, the Mortons, or the Clenocks, they were exposed to injury,

\* "Bannes the Schoolman pleadeth that subjects are not bound to desert or resist their prince, when such actions necessarily infer danger of death and loss of goods."—Fuller.

† "They considered (saith Master Sanders) that they were the Queen's subjects, and that such a fact might peradventure have procured some tumult and scandal and trouble of the whole ecclesiastical state and order; and also might probably have stirred up some persecution."—Watson's *Decacordon*, p. 260.

‡ Watson's *Decacordon* was written when the miserable consequences of the Bull had been experienced for twenty years: but some of his description of the distress of the Roman Catholics at that time I have ventured to use as a foreboding. "They sometimes cast their eyes aside to Turks, to Persians, to all Pagan provinces, to see if they can espy any one sect, profession, or professors of religion tossed, travailed and tormented as the English are: and through all this vast macrocosm they find not one pattern, sampler, nor example left to posterity to be recorded like to ours" (p. 274). Watson, who was one of them who hated the Bull and its abettors, answers severely to this lament that "No nation under heaven can be named where the subjects, especially if they were Catholics, ever sought the death of their sovereign, though of a different religion from them, the conquest of their native land, &c., as the Spanish faction have sought it in our own flesh and blood against this realm."



loss, and pains, which these very men had fled their country to avoid.\* The shock was greater than can be easily supposed. The life of the nation was concentrated in the Queen, who was denounced and menaced so disgracefully. As for the insuperable cohort, they disliked the Bull as much as the rest: and Bishop Watson, the most powerful member of their body after the death of Bonner, openly expressed his dissatisfaction.† In fact, the Bull displaced the insuperable cohort. It began a new system, founding a new ministry.

The news of the Bull was received with surprise and displeasure by the crowned heads of Europe. The King of Spain wrote to his ambassador in London complaining that the Pope had not consulted him in any way: the Duke of Alva wrote to the English envoy in Paris that the Pope had never done anything that so much displeased his master.‡ In France the

\* From the first the Bull was imputed to the exiles. "As to the first procurers of it, were it D. Harding, D. Stapleton, D. Morton, D. Webbe, all or any, they were . . . but simple men out of their positive divinity, and did mightily overshoot themselves in it divers ways."—Watson's *Decacordon*, p. 260. "The same Doctor Morton was the principal mean of the sentence given against the Queen in the Consistory at Rome, as this Examine was advertised." Exam. of Bp. of Ross, Nov. 1571.—Murdin, p. 60.

† "In some of the Catholic bishops, when her Majesty began to reign, there was a rash affection or zeal to imitate St. Ambrose by excommunicating her and others; yet (as Mr. Sanders noteth) *prudentialiores episcopi, vel certe mansuetiores* were of another opinion, and prevailed. Indeed he further saith that they altogether thought it meet to refer the consideration of that matter to the Pope's wisdom: but it appeareth not that they did afterward solicit his Holiness thereto. But the contrary will readily be proved by some that are alive, who can testify that they were far from that mind, especially afterwards, when they had better considered what was likely to ensue, if any such excommunication should be procured. And it will likewise be justified sufficiently that Bishop Watson was exceedingly grieved when he heard that Pius Quintus had been drawn to that course."—*Ib.*

‡ "His Holiness has taken this step without communicating with me

Bull reached Paris through the Cardinal of Lorraine : but remained unpublished through the reluctance of the King, the distraction of the civil war, and the fitful prospect of an alliance with England. The Emperor at Spires expressed his strong disgust. Cobham, the English ambassador, being called to the imperial presence, spoke indignantly against "the insolent pride of the Bishop of Rome, who had given out such a writing against a Christian princess": that, "if this were tolerated, his detestable pride might aspire to trouble with his poison the state of the greatest potentate in Christendom." Maximilian answered that he had seen a copy of the Bull at Prague, had shown himself therewith discontented to the Papal Nuncio, and had been told that the Pope meant to recall it. He "used sharp words against the Pope" to Cobham :\* and a few days afterwards himself wrote to the Pope urging him to recall the Bull.† At the same time the

in any way, which certainly has greatly surprised me, because my knowledge of English affairs is such that I believe I could give a better opinion upon them and the course that ought to have been adopted under the circumstances than any one else. Since however his Holiness allowed himself to be carried away by his zeal, he no doubt thought that what he did was the only thing requisite for all to turn out as he wished : and if such were the case, I of all the faithful sons of the Holy See would rejoice the most. But I fear that not only will this not be the case, but that this sudden and unexpected step will exacerbate feeling there, and drive the Queen and her friends the more to oppress and persecute the few good Catholics still remaining in England." Philip to Guerau de Spes, June 30. — *Span. Cal.* 254. The Spanish ambassador in Paris called on Norris, the English envoy, and read him a letter from Alva declaring that "the Pope had not done anything that so displeased his master as the late declaration." Norris to the Queen, July 9. — *For. Cal.* 291.

\* Cobham to Cecil, Sept. 17. — *For. Cal.*, p. 339.

† 28 Sept. See the Pope's letter in reply of Jan. 5, 1571 (Raynaldus, p. 177). I suppose that Cobham's violent remonstrance to the Emperor must be the origin of the improbable story of Raynaldus that Elizabeth begged the Emperor to intercede with the Pope to recall the Bull. In proof of this he cites the Pope's letter to the Emperor. But there is nothing in the Pope's letter to show that Elizabeth made any entreaties.

High Pontiff scrupled not to apply himself to the most powerful subjects of these princes. To the Duke of Anjou, the recent victor of Moncontour, he sent the present of a sword and a hat with great solemnity and the solicitation of "some invasion against England." \* To the Duke of Alva he wrote twice, vehemently beseeching him to publish the Bull in the Netherlands, particularly in the seaports, where the English might see it; and again, urgently requiring him to aid the rebellion in England; † placing at his disposition for the purpose the sum of six

The Pope says that he cannot see why she makes such ado, and he defies her threats. This is consonant enough with the high language held by Cobham to the Emperor. "Si sententiam excommunicationis nostram magni æstimat," says the Pope, "cur ad S. M. Ecclesiæ gremium non revertitur: si vero eam nullius momenti esse existimat, cur de ea tantopere laborat? Nam quod ad ejus minas et in nos odium pertinet, tantum abest ut id vel pertimescamus vel vitare velimus, ut, si illud profundendo nostro sanguine explere posset, multo id gratius receptiusque futurum esset quam Pontificatus ipse." Becchetti gives the same story of Elizabeth imploring the Pope through the Emperor, but has nothing to go upon beyond the Pope's words above quoted. "Ricorse all' Imperatore Massimiliano, perchè colla sua mediazione fosse dal santo Padre rievocata. L'Augusto Massimiliano assunse di fatto l'impegno, ma il S. Pontifice *ai cinque del mese di Gennaio* dell' anno seguente gli rispose con petto apostolico, che non poteva rievocare la scomunica fino a tanto che Elisabetta stava separata dalla Cattolica Chiesa, e dalla comunione della santa Sede" (xii. 152). Lingard and Tierney's *Dodd* repeat the story.

\* June 15.—*For. Cal.* 268. Among the rumours of the hour was that Anjou should be lodged in Scotland with six thousand men.—*Ib.*

† "Litteras Apostolicas, sub plumbo, adversus eam quæ se pro Angliæ regina gerit, nuper edidimus: quas ad te mittimus, nobilitatem tuam hortantes, et in Domino vehementer obsecrantes, ut eas in ista Provincia, quæ fidei tuæ regenda est commissa, precipue autem in locis maritimis, quorum cum Anglicis hominibus, illuc mercaturæ causa commeantibus, major solet esse communio, . . . publicandas promulgandasque cures." Mar. 30, 1570.—*Raynaldus*, 175. "Rogamus ut in hac charissimi in Christo filii nostri Hispaniarum regis voluntate, ut commode facere potest (nobilitas tua), quicquid ad eas ipsas (Anglorum) copias vel tuendas, vel augendas, vel adjuvandas conferre valet, ne id prætermittere velit," &c. Feb. 4, 1570.—*Ib.* 173.



hundred thousand ducats.\* The Bull was expected, or arrived, in Antwerp in the beginning of June.† At that time “not a breath of the Bull was whispered” in England: but the ardent ambassador of Spain heard that it was coming from Calais; and looked forward to the publication of it. “If it be published, it will cause great excitement both here and in Ireland.”‡

The only publication which the Bull obtained was through the means of one of the Spanish ambassador’s household, by the hand of a fanatical English gentleman, in England, on a gate. A copy was received or brought from abroad by Peter Berga, Guerau’s chaplain, a Catalan, prebendary of Tarragona: who, having conveyed it to an English subject, himself precipitately departed from the kingdom, leaving it to the zeal of his associate to display the incendiary document. John Felton, a gentleman by birth, who from the beginning of the reign had been disaffected to the Queen’s proceedings, dared the danger, chose Paul’s Yard for the scene, posted there the Bull on the gate of the Bishop of London, about the beginning of June, where it remained a night; and, disdaining flight, was taken, tried for high treason at the Guildhall under the ancient common law of England, and suffered the full punishment of the crime in August.§

\* March 28. “The Pope has granted 600,000 ducats toward the aid of the Catholics in England, and the Duke of Florence 200,000: the bestowing of which money the Duke of Alva shall have.” Hogan to Norris.—*For. Cal.* 209. It was long before it was known abroad how completely the rebellion had failed.

† “From Rome it is written that the Pope has put into his curse the Queen’s Majesty and all that be of her religion, and has given pardon and remission of sins to all that rebel against her. The Bulls are daily looked for. He has given the realm of England to any that will join the enterprise.” Fitzwilliam to Leicester and Cecil, Antwerp, June 6.—*For. Cal.* 262.

‡ Guerau de Spes to the King, May 13.—*Span. Cal.* 244. Guerau was now in the thick of the Ridolfi plot.

§ It is curious that three dates have been given for Felton’s exploit.

The rejection of the Bull by the powers of Christendom brought the aid of guidance to the dismayed Romanensians. Soon after Felton's exploit, Lord

Strype gives March 2; Stow, followed by Froude, gives May 25; the Roman Catholic writers give June 2, Corpus Christi Day. Undoubtedly it was June, as it is mentioned as a recent occurrence in a Spanish letter of that month.—*Span. Cal.* 251. Strype further relates that the Bull was set up on a bridge in Paris on the same day that it was set up in London by Felton; that it was torn down by a servant of the English embassy, and the fragments carried by Walsingham to the French King, who expressed great indignation. He is followed by Butler, Soames, and others. The incident is undeniable, as it is related by Walsingham himself; but it is evident that it took place not at the time of Felton's exploit, but in the year following, and in that year on the day that Strype assigns to Felton's exploit. "The 2 of this month, which was the day my lord of Buckhurst took his leave, there was set up a Bull, which was at Ponte de St. Estienne, of the same day that Felton's was, containing the selfsame matter: which a servant of mine finding, by reason of many flocking about it, tore it down and brought me the same: whereupon my lord of Buckhurst and I upon conference, before his said access, immediately broke with the king in that behalf. The king called me unto him, and asked me the contents of the said Bull; whereof being advertised, as also I presenting unto him so much of the said Bull as was given me by my servant, he showed himself very much moved thereat, in such sort as we might very well see it was unfeigned: forthwith he called Lansac unto him, and willed him to take order with the judge criminal for the searching out of the setter of the same, assuring us, if by any means he could be found, he should receive such punishment as such a presumption required, considering the good amity between him and his good sister. I showed him that if he did not take order in this, the like measure might be measured to himself. He answered that he did perceive that very well; and that whosoever he were that should seem to touch in honour any of his confederates, he would make account of him accordingly. After my departure from the king, Lansac told me in mine ear that he had great cause to guess that this was some Spanish practice." Walsingham to Cecil, Paris, March 5, 1579.—Digges' *Complete Ambassador*, p. 49. Walsingham went not to Paris before the autumn of 1570. His Instructions are dated August 11, 1570.—*Ib.*, p. 18. As to Felton's execution divers accounts are given. Bridgewater says that "alius quidam qui Feltono eas litteras affigenti adstabat" fled the kingdom and advised Felton to follow; and that when he was arrested he said with some hesitation, "Si vere Pii V. Pont. Max. litteræ essent, merito sibi eas venerandas videri; se enim agnoscere illum esse Jesu Christi Vicarium in terris."—*Concertatio*, p. 42. Gabutius says that the Bull got into England through the concealed Papal agent Ridolfi, from whom

Morley, a consistent upholder of the Holy See, retired to the Continent; whether, as it has been supposed, from the desire of escaping the necessity of denying

Felton, among others, got a copy: and that many were put to death, as well as Felton, for making copies of it: "Quamplurimi, quod manu sua ea descripsissent, capitis supplicium publice pertulerunt."—*Vita Pii Quinti*, p. 104. On the contrary, Felton's death was "the first action of any capital punishment for matter sent from Rome."—Burleigh's *Execution for Treason* (in Gibson's *Preservative*, vol. xvii.). It is to be noted that he suffered not for religion, but for "treason in the highest degree," according to the lucid argument of Sir E. Coke: "The publishing of this Bull by a subject against his sovereign was treason in the highest degree by the ancient common laws of England; for if it were treason to publish a Bull of excommunication within this realm against a subject thereof, as was adjudged in the time of King Edward I, *a fortiori* it is treason in the highest degree to publish such a Bull against the sovereign and monarch herself."—*Reports*, pt. v, *Caudrey's Case*. He was arraigned at the Guildhall, Aug. 4, and executed Aug. 8, at the place where he had offended, on a gallows set up there that morning. The account of his martyric boldness given by Lingard and others is not absolutely confirmed by the official report put out at the time. According to this, he was visited in Newgate by three ministers and exhorted as to his opinions: answered arrogantly, but was overcome, and could say no more. Being ready to go down to the hurdle, they bade him acknowledge "his heinous fact . . . that he had set up the traitorous and malignant scroll termed a Bull; and moreover denied the Queen's supremacy. He answered wilfully that he knew well enough what he had done; howbeit he said he was sorry for it." Being bidden to put his trust in Christ's death and thereby only hope to be saved, "he answered arrogantly and contrary to Christ's doctrine, which is the true and sincere religion, that he believed the ancient and catholic faith which the Holy Father the Pope hath long defended." He said, "Whosoever believeth or holdeth any other faith, it is most wicked and erroneous." He came down in a satin doublet and a grogram gown, and asked the people to pray for him. As he was laid on the hurdle and drawn to Paul's Churchyard, he repeated the *De Profundis* in Latin. He was asked by one to call for mercy, and only hope to be saved by Christ's death: but he made no audible answer. The sheriff bade him ask mercy and be sorry for his treason; he said, "I am sorry for it, and I ask God heartily mercy." When the hangman stripped him of his doublet and gown, he stood up, "quivering and shaking with fear." He protested that he never meant any treason beyond setting up the Bull. But on further urging, he at last bade them show the Queen "that he was most heartily sorry for his fact that he was condemned for, and that he besought her Grace to forgive him." "That is well said," answered the sheriff, and bade him will the people to forgive and



the right and title of the excommunicated Queen, which the publication of the Papal sentence may have seemed to lay upon him, or to avoid some other religious inconvenience, it has been disputed.\* If the former, he might have stayed in England. The question of the obligation of a promulged Bull was put by another loyal Romanensian peer, the Earl of Southampton, to an authority whom none of the party would dispute: and the Bishop of Ross, the able and learned Lesley, who was then lodging in Lambeth, solved it by explaining that such Bulls, before they can bind, must be put in execution; a thing which depended on princes, not on individuals.† Common sense or cunning may

pray for him; which he did. He then said, "O Lord, into Thy hands I commend my spirit," in English; and as he was repeating it in Latin, he was turned off.—*End and Confession of Jn. Felton*, printed by Rd. Jones and Tho. Colwell, 1570: in Cobbett's *State Trials*, p. 1086. Here is nothing of his sending a ring to the Queen, as some relate. Dodd, Lingard, and others say that he was tortured, "laid on the rack": and that an accomplice in the Inns of Court betrayed him through the same persuasive; and this has been recently repeated by Mr. Cooper in the *Dict. of Nat. Biog.* It seems to rest on a manuscript account by Mrs. Salisbury, his daughter. It seems improbable. Felton owned the fact; then why should he have been "put on the rack to extort a further confession"? The rack was in the Tower; we find no mention of him sent to the Tower, but Newgate. Neither Stow, Bridgewater, nor Gabutius knows of this torture. As soon as he was finished, the executioner went back to Newgate for two young fellows who had been tried in the same dock with him for coining; they suffered the like at Tyburn.—Stow, 667.

\* Lingard says that Morley left the kingdom to escape the prosecutions with which he was threatened for having assisted at Mass. From Morley's letters in Haynes, he had done something to displease the Queen, and a jury had been empanelled in all shires where he had lands to make presentment of some articles touching his truth to her Majesty. He thought this to be unknown to the Queen and to Burleigh.—Haynes' *State Papers*, 604, 605, 622.

† The Bishop of Ross met Southampton by appointment after dark in May, 1570, in St. George's Fields. Ross related that among other things the earl said to him, "But I pray you tell me what think you of this Bull that is now published abroad, whether if the subjects of this land may with safe conscience obey the Queen as our righteous princess:

qualify the outbreaks of folly: but it is not clear how far such an explanation may have relieved the distress of the English subjects. Roman Catholic writers have applauded the effort of the Pontiff to plunge Christendom in war: they have adorned with the glory of martyrdom the Englishman who died to effectuate an edict that might have ruined his country. The position taken by the Popedom has never been abandoned, but reasserted: and the Church which canonized Pius has beatified Felton.\*

Counterblasts were prepared without long delay. Two were rapidly produced by Norton, and published by Day. They were mere popular tracts, very indecent, playing upon the ambiguity of the word Bull. The one, *The Disclosing of the Great Bull*, has been

or if it shall be danger to our conscience or not. For I hear of sundry that are departed this realm for the same cause, for even then was the Lord Morley departed, and not long before Mr. Shelley, Sheldon, and others. To this I answered that I could not think there was so great danger to men's conscience by virtue of that Bull, as that they should be driven to leave their country, wife, children, and lands for the same: for albeit it did absolve the subjects from their obedience, yet were they not charged under pains of cursing, nor censures of the Church, to withdraw their obedience from her: and if no other forces were sent by the Pope and other princes for execution of the said Bull, it appeared to me to be but a threatening: and in that respect my opinion was that no subject of this land should hazard himself and his estate for that cause: for it appertained to the great princes of Christendom to set forward the reformation or alteration of religion; and was sufficient to the subjects that they were constrained to obey; as the people of Israel being in Babylon captives and compelled to forbear the service of God, did by the counsel of the prophets worship God in their hearts, which was acceptable in the presence of God." The earl replied that "it were better to lose all he had, nor to live under cursing in this country, for then should he be in continual fear of conscience." Ross answered that "there was no danger to obey the Queen *in temporalibus*, but in matters of his religion, if he were pressed, though he could not well obey against his conscience; and so long as the Queen was the strongest party, he might well obey." Here they were interrupted by the watch.—Murdin, p. 40.

\* Felton was beatified by the present Pope, Leo XIII, in 1886.

reprinted, though it is of no historical value: the other, *An Addition declaratory of the Bulls, with a searching of the Maze*, aimed at instructing the people to distinguish "the Bull of reconciliation," which Doctor Morton brought to the camp of the rebels of the north (as it has been seen), from "the Bull of deposition": that the Bull which was to reconcile to the Pope those who had attended the English Service was "not the same Bull that was set up at the bishop's gate, as many suppose, but another"; that "there were two Bulls." It contains some interesting particulars of the times; but the dates of events confute the assertion which is made in it that the northern rebels had the latter Bull with them under seal, and would have published it if they could have "got into their company such a head as they desired to set up after our Queen," intimating no doubt the Queen of Scots.\* Other answers were of higher literary kind. The great Jewel extended his wide controversial labours to *A View of a Seditious Bull*; which was more worthy of himself than the occasion of him. The learned and friendly Bullinger, at the instance of Grindal, Cox, and Jewel, perfected a *Refutation of the Papistical Bull*, which was universally approved,

\* These are small blackletter tracts, of 1570. The *Disclosing of the Great Bull* is reprinted in the *Harleian Miscell.*, vol. vii. The *Addition declaratory* contains among other things a curious story of a false rumour of a great battle in Ireland where an angel with a chalice in his hand discomfited the English host, and that thereupon there were public rejoicings in Spain attended with the greatest presences. As to the assertion that the northern rebels had with them the Bull of excommunication, Norton seems to have mistaken the February of 1569, when he says that the Pope prepared the Bull, for the February of 1570, when he did prepare it. Certainly however the northern men were told by Doctor Morton that such a Bull was to come. See last chapter. These tracts, together with Norton's former tract on the Bull of reconciliation, are bound together in the little volume, C. 37, d. 36, Brit. Mus.



and, by order of Parker, was printed by Day both in Latin and English.\*

But the most characteristic of these vindications, exhibiting the handwriting and, by probability, the authorship of Cecil, have never seen the light. Two treatises remain in our archives, of contiguous though separate date, in which Elizabeth's Secretary defends the ancient independence of the English Church, and depicts the troubles created in the realm by "the tyrannous warrant of the Bishop of Rome," the Bull. One of these is remarkable in that Elizabeth therein first received her title of Great from him who best could tell how she deserved it, and who won it for himself in her service: † the other in that it indicated the principle on which the Elizabethan comprehension by uniformity had hitherto proceeded, and laid it down that not even the exigency newly risen, the seminaries,

\* These writings of Jewel and Bullinger are in their works. Many particulars about them are given in the second volume of Strype's *Annals*, and in his *Life of Grindal*, 171. Bishop Cox, himself a man of war, was greatly delighted with Bullinger's performance: "Bullæ furorem compescis: authorem jugulasti" (*Zurich Lett.* i. 143). Bullinger's letter of thanks to the English bishops is in *ib.* ii. 178. Also a letter from Day to Bullinger: and another from Hilles with some particulars of the publication. It was out by the beginning of 1572: Parkhurst to Bullinger. —*ib.* i. 266.

† The former of these papers is *England Triumphant*, apparently left unfinished. There are two copies in the Record Office, one entirely in Cecil's hand, the other with many corrections and additions by Cecil. Look at *Cal. Dom. Eliz.*, p. 402. It is a poor and verbose composition, which proves that fancy needs wings. It is spoken in the person of England "to all Monarchs, Kings, and Princes absolute of Christendom." England extols the peace and prosperity of many years, and laments the "exceeding great envy in some corners of Christendom, and express and bloody censures against the dignity of me, an ancient famous kingdom and a noble member of Christendom, and my most dear worthy Christian Queen, a peerless virgin Queen and Prince of this age, my Queen whom I may call Elizabeth." England goes on to call Elizabeth "the Great, the most excellent creature at this time by God's ordinance within my continent": and then plunges into antiquity as far as Julius Cæsar, Brutus, and King Lucius.

the secret practices, the libels, the floods of calumny, should provoke to any alteration of it.\* To think what they would, to say what they listed in private, to have their conscience unsearched by any process, articles, interrogatories, so long as they observed her religion with decency, attending their parish church, and by their outward compliance numbering themselves in the communion of the realm, had hitherto been her government in the spiritual estate : and this she proposed to continue. It is a distinction that has not been remarked by her historians : but she drew it really, and may claim it not unjustly. Her minister and she alike regarded it as a very important distinction ; as a great advance in liberty and generosity.

\* This latter is entitled "An Advertisement meet for all persons, that is for good subjects to continue in their duties, for wavering subjects to become more constant in theirs, and for all unloyal subjects to know their errors and by repentance to recover mercy." It is entirely in Cecil's hand. Look at *Cal. Dom.*, p. 391. It is a grave and severe treatise, of which the date seems from some indications to be somewhat later than the other : nor indeed is it likely that Cecil would have written two at once. He depicts the dangers of the state from traitors and rebels, describes the seminaries pouring forth Jesuits, and men who sowed sedition "under the cloke of priesthood," aiming "to bring the realm not only into a war against strangers, but into a war domestical and civil, wherein no blood is usually spared, nor mercy yielded," and denounces the slanderous and "infamous" reports that were spread in foreign courts, "that a number of holy persons had been of late put to torments and death for profession of the Catholic religion." He concludes with a memorable declaration that nevertheless the Queen would not be moved from the general course which she had pursued from the beginning, of requiring the outward obedience of all, but forcing the conscience of none, and letting opinion go free. "Let these libellers and slanderers stay their wicked courses, and there shall be no colour or occasion to shed the blood of any of her Majesty's subjects that shall only profess devotion in their religion without bending their labours maliciously to disturb the common quiet of the realm, and therewith to cause sedition and rebellion to occupy the place of peace against it, which Almighty God continue His Spirit and power upon her Majesty to persevere as the Supreme Governor under His Almightyness over her people being her natural subjects, who generally praise God for her peaceable government more than any nation in the most part of Christendom."

So it was, the circumstances considered. Her Unity stood face to face with the Papal Unity. She had to marshal her realm in unity of spiritual things against the unity or combination of which the Holy See was the centre, which bound many nations together, and which but lately has asserted itself cruelly even in England by such probing of conscience as would have let none escape. It would have been the instant triumph of that terrific system, if she had been able to oppose to it not a unity, but a herd of sects. Her principle of outward union and inward liberty has not been understood by easier ages, and commends not itself now. But it is to be noted that it would never have existed but for the method of the opposite system, which it could neither ignore nor altogether forsake. What was fallacious in the English ecclesiastical polity of the sixteenth century was learned from popery; what advanced towards true liberty was of native quality.

It was for Elizabeth herself to explain her own intention in her proceedings. She wrote, or caused to be written, more than one explanation: but again it is remarkable that the most elaborate of these, like the efforts of Cecil, never met the gaze of her subjects. A long and grave *Declaration of the Queen's Proceedings since her Reign* exists in two copies. Cecil composed, it is likely; but Elizabeth corrected: and her emendations may be said almost to make a new piece of it. They are judicious, graceful, and characteristic; showing skill in phraseology, and great command of the English language. The paper, after one posthumous appearance in a collection, has been held to the light in the present day by the admiration of eminent historical students.\* The Queen vindicates

\* This interesting document was first printed in Haynes' *State Papers*,



the ecclesiastical position of the realm against the Pope, rebukes the rage of the Bull, declares the leniency of her government from the beginning, and

1740, p. 589. Bishop Creighton has justly extolled it.—*Queen Elizabeth*, p. 133. Professor Collins has printed it for the first time, not from the copy among the Burleigh papers at Hatfield, but from the other original, in the Record Office, which has Elizabeth's corrections in her own handwriting. He has carefully exhibited these, with remarks and notes. He gives the following summary: "Elizabeth sets forth at length the principles upon which her whole government had been based, first as regards civil affairs, and then as regards religion. In each respect she affirms that there is no breach with the past, that nothing novel, extravagant, or unwarranted has taken place: in each respect, on the other hand, she boldly challenges a comparison between her government and that of her predecessors. Meantime she lays stress upon the fact that it was no part of her policy to coerce men's consciences. And on this basis she appeals to her people to judge between her government and those who are sowing sedition within her realm."—*Queen Elizabeth's Defence*, p. 32, Ch. Hist. Soc. 1899. There is a summary, or rather description of contents, in *Cal. Dom.*, p. 364. Take as specimens the following passage on her ecclesiastical authority: her alterations are in brackets. "We know no other authority, either given or used by us as Queen and Governor of this Realm, than hath been always (annexed to the Crown of this realm, and) due to our progenitors, sovereigns and kings of the same (as by good sufficient and ancient authorities is to be proved)," &c. Not that "we do either challenge or take to us, as malicious persons do unduly surmise, any superiority to ourselves (ourselves) to define, decide or determine any article or point of the Christian faith and religion, or to change any ancient (rite or) ceremony of the Church from the form before received and observed by the Catholic and Apostolic Church, or the use of (that we do challenge or use) any function (or office) belonging to any ecclesiastical (prelate or) person (of what degree soever) being a minister of the Word and (or) Sacraments in the Church," &c. And this as to forcing the conscience: "We know not nor have (affirm that we never had) any meaning (or intent) to allow that any of our subjects should be (troubled or) molested either (*omit* either) by examination or inquisition in any matter either of (their) faith, so long as they shall profess the Christian faith (in) not gainsaying the authority of the holy Scriptures and of (*read* nor denying) the articles of our faith contained in (any of) the Creeds Apostolic and Catholic (received and used in the Church), or for matter of ceremonies, or any other external matters (or for their opinion in any rites and ceremonies) pertaining to Christian religion, as long as they shall in their outward conversation show themselves quiet and conformable and not manifestly repugnant and obstinate to the laws of the realm (*omit* of the realm) which are established for frequentation of divine service in the (*read* by the whole realm for

above all denies that she intended to allow the conscience of her subjects to be troubled by inquisition or examination. But perhaps this apologetic writing was more than the subject might expect or the prince offer: it can hardly have been without cause that so many vindications hung between the pen and the press: in a short time the Queen put forth a royal Proclamation containing the same matter in more peremptory style. Herein she desired to make it known that she would not have the consciences of her subjects sifted unnecessarily, to know what affection they had towards the old religion. "So long," she declared, "as her subjects continued to observe the laws, and not manifestly break them by their open actions, her meaning was not to have any of them molested by any inquisition or examination of their consciences": that the rumours which were spread of examinations to be had of men's consciences were untrue, malicious, or fearful: and that none had been molested or called before the Council for religion save such as had openly broken the laws established for religion in not coming to church at all, to common prayer and divine service, as they had been accustomed for nine or ten years together before this time: intimating that such cases had not been numerous. This Proclamation was published in the Star Chamber.\*

resorting to their) ordinary churches, in like manner as all other laws are, whereunto subjects are of duty and by allegiance bound (*read instead* or places of common prayers, and using there of divine services)."

\* June 15, 1570.—Strype, i. 622; Collins, *Elizabeth's Defence*, App. 2. The words that intimate fewness are, "Although certain persons have been lately convented before her Majesty's Council upon just causes, and that some of them have been treated withal upon some matter of religion, yet the cause thereof hath grown merely of themselves." Certainly there are very few cases of religion in the Acts of the Privy Council that have been preserved. It may be observed however that this Proclamation makes no mention of the High Commission.

It was evoked not only by the necessities of the State but by the alarm of the Romanensians : and by their adversaries it was attributed to the instant suit of the higher among them. "They are straining every nerve to be allowed to live according to their consciences, and that no account of his religion may be required of any," cried Cox to Bullinger.\* Some further official notice was taken of the Bull, and the inquietation which it brought, in another Proclamation, "against Bills and Bulls," which quickly followed : that any one receiving any slanderous writing or print should bring it to the next justice and relate the circumstances ; and that any who discovered the authors "should be so largely rewarded that during their lives they should have just cause to think themselves well used."† The country was now infested indeed with seditious libels, many of them threatening the Queen's life by prognosticating her death. These declarations remain for a testimony of the lightness of the pressure of the Elizabethan uniformity, and an indication of the tranquil compromise, or unforced reconciliation, which might have been attained with time, but for the leaden missile of the Pope.

In one of the Queen's vindications, which have been considered, it was deemed necessary to assert that the

\* "Sunt apud nos non infimæ sortis. papistæ, qui nervis omnibus contendunt, ut sibi suisque conscientis vivere permittantur, utque nulla ratio suæ religionis a quoquam exigatur." 10 July.—*Zurich Lett.* i. 129. The remark of Neal on this Proclamation breathes of a later spirit, that spirit for which Puritanism is at once to be applauded and condemned. "So that if men would be hypocrites, her Majesty would leave them to God ; but if they would not conform, they must suffer the law." He holds that it "affected Puritans as well as Papists."—*Puritans*, i. 207. No ; by no means Puritans as a body.

† July, 1570.—*Strype*, i. 615. This Proclamation seems to rank among these libels the "Bulla papistica in nostram Angliam clam submissa," as Cox calls it : to Bullinger, *Zurich Lett.* i. 129.



Church ought to be "governed and taught by archbishops, bishops, and ministers, according to the ecclesiastical ancient policy of the realm."\* It was at this time that the Nonconformist agitation moved from habits, apparel, and ceremonies to the attack of the hierarchy, the existing form and institutions of Church government. It was still within the Church, not designing to quit the Church, but believing that it had the perfect right, as well as the power, of altering things to its own liking, even though it meditated nothing less than the subversion of the order inherited from primitive antiquity. The vestimentary altercation, and the arguments used in it, which appeared contemptible to Parker, may have seemed to the Puritans themselves insufficient to warrant the prolongation of strife: and yet they could not desist with satisfaction. They had seen the old system upset in the reformed Churches of the continent by the precipitate rashness of the best scholars and theologians of an age of imperfect learning: on this account it is the less to be wondered that they rushed against episcopacy with

\* This is one of the most curiously amended and extended passages in the Manuscript Declaration of her proceedings. Her alterations are here given in brackets, her omissions in italics. "To provide that the Church may be governed and taught by archbishops, bishops (pastors), and (such other ecclesiastical) ministers (and curates as by) *according to the ecclesiastical ancient policy of (used in) the realm, whom we do assist with our sovereign power* (hath been in former ages ordained. Whom also we know that our duty is to assist with the power which God hath given us, as they being the ministers of the Church, may, according to the law of God and the true rules and articles of our Christian faith, retain our people in obedience to their Almighty God, and to live as Christians to the salvation of their souls which Christ hath redeemed). An office and charge (belonging) as we think properly *due* to all Christian monarchs and princes sovereigns, whereby they *only* (principally) differ (both in name and deed) from (the best of) pagan princes *that* (who when they do their best take only) only take care of their subjects' bodies (and earthly lives) without respect to the salvation of their souls, or of *the* (any) life hereafter (immortally) to come."—Collins' *Q. Elizabeth's Defence*, 43.

full confidence : for some of the questions concerning episcopacy have hardly been settled after three centuries by the keenest research of modern criticism. A younger generation was rising around the vestimentary champions. Their leader was Thomas Cartwright, a Bachelor of Theology, a Fellow of Trinity, whom we have seen already in high reputation at Cambridge. When Doctor Chaderton resigned the Margaret and took the Royal Chair of Theology, at the end of 1569, Cartwright succeeded him. An incessant student, who allowed himself but five hours of sleep ; young himself, of thirty-five years ; of boundless influence among the young ; as inflexible in his convictions as bold in his utterance ; an orator who filled to overflowing the churches and the lecture-rooms ; a Latinist who commanded the admiration of Beza, he seemed born to be the Calvin of England, the victorious founder of a new regiment who believed himself to be the restorer of the oldest and purest. He was defeated in his attempt to storm episcopacy. From first to last he found himself opposed to men equally in earnest, equally convinced, equally learned, and endowed with even higher gifts of thought and language. His fame is half buried in his defeat : but sincerity and fervent piety were the head of his attractions ; and his uprightness of dealing, which has been questioned, will not be denied by those who can weigh the age. The system which he sought to impose was destined to triumph briefly long after he was in the grave : and in the interval his image had faded. He is chiefly remembered as the whetstone of the wit of another. Neither his discipline nor his disciples took a permanent designation from his name.\* Presbyterianism

\* Nor, it may be added, from that of Knox, whose fame however is not obscure. The name of Calvin overshadowed all. But at one time

is not the soil of greatness. And yet this half-forgotten leader has wrung from literature the distinction of a man of genius.\*

Cartwright had not delivered many lectures in the Margaret Chair when his predecessor felt himself impelled to send to the Chancellor, Cecil, a grave representation of the state of Cambridge; that the new reader was teaching doctrines which were intolerable in a Christian commonwealth; as, that in the Church of England there was no lawful calling and admitting of ministers, that the name and office of archbishop, dean, archdeacon, were impious, and the election of bishops and ministers at that day was tyrannical. He related that there were other lecturers and disputants in the schools, adherents of Cartwright, who attacked abuses, which was not amiss, but that they burst out into a heat of pernicious articles; as, that the Court of Faculties was all damnable and devilish, and that the Queen's laws permitted many devilish and damnable things: that bishops were good; but nowadays wrongly elected, and usurpers of authority over the clergy.† These assertions were of Cartwright's inspiration, and

it seemed to be otherwise. We read in Watson's *Decacordon*, 1602, p. 275, a year before Cartwright's death, "Catholics live together in peace with those of other professions, sects, and opinions, unless it be where only the Consistorian, Calvinian, Cartwrightian Puritans do rule the roast."

\* It is applied to him by Froude, x. p. 115. He has fared variously among the moderns. Macaulay, who has a word for Hooker, neglects him entirely. Hallam says, "A deserved reputation for virtue, learning, and acuteness, an ardent zeal, an inflexible self-confidence, a vigorous, rude and arrogant style, marked him as the formidable leader of a religious faction."—*Const. Hist.* i. 185. Mr. Green denounces him with vigour. Some very judicious remarks are made upon him by Marsden, *Early Puritans*, i. 78. Bishop Paget reviews him with kindly discrimination in his recent valuable Introduction to Hooker.

† See more fully Strype, i. 623: who seems to be quoting Chaderton's letter, which he calls "MS. penes me," June 11.



at this time, probably upon some requisition, he delivered them in the form of two Articles to the Vice-chancellor May.\* His Articles were sent to Grindal, now Archbishop of York, who was in London: and Grindal passed them to Cecil with a strong letter. "The youth of the University are in danger to be poisoned by him with love of contention and of novelties: the Vice-chancellor and the Heads proceed not so roundly as they should: I wish that you would silence this man and his adherents both in schools and pulpits: reduce them to conformity or expel them: let not this Bachelor of Divinity proceed doctor: besides his other singularity he is not conformable in his apparel."† Cecil's answer was read in the Regents' House on the day that Cartwright designed to take his degree; in a scene of great commotion he was stopped by the Vice-chancellor from proceeding, and

\* "Archiepiscoporum et Archidiaconorum nomina suspecta sunt.

1. Archiepiscoporum, Archidiaconorum, Cancellariorum, Commissariorum, &c., ut hodie apud nos sunt, munera apostolica institutione non nituntur: cui restituendæ quisque pro vocatione sua studere debet (intelligo autem id pro vocatione sua) ut Magistratus autoritate, Ecclesiæ ministri verbo, singuli eam promoveant. Ita tamen ut nihil tumultuarie aut seditiose fiat. 2. Ministrorum electio, quæ apud nos est, ab institutione Apostolica deflexit: cui restituendæ, sicut prædictum est, singuli studere debent. Nolim autem me putet quispiam omnes damnare, tanquam a ministerio alienos, qui ad illam institutionem hactenus non fuerint cooptati." After these Articles is written in the original, "Then follow other assertions uttered at other times by the said Cartwright. 1. That he himself being a Reader of Divinity is a Doctor exercising the office named Eph. iv: and therefore must only read and may not preach. 2. No Ministers are to be made, nor no Pastors to be admitted without election and consent of the people. 3. He that hath a cure may not preach, but only to his own flock. With many other such phantasies" (not *falsities*, as Strype).—Strype's *Grindal*, 162–3; Collier, vi. 482. These are enclosed in a letter of Grindal to Cecil (see next note), which is endorsed "For some order to be taken at Cambridge for Mr. Cartwright."—*State Pap. Dom. Eliz.* lxxi. 23; *Cal.* p. 382.

† June 24.—Strype's *Grindal*, p. 162; Collier, vi. 482; *Dom. Cal.*, p. 382.

to Cecil the same day the Heads returned the answer that in due time they would reduce disorder to conformity.\* On the other hand, the admirers of Cartwright addressed themselves to the same authority in a swarm, and with a zeal and persistency which proved his ascendancy over them. They denied that in his lectures he had provoked discord: as to the vestiary controversy, it was a calumny to say that he had ever so much as touched upon it: and as to the ministry, he had done no more than offer considerations with caution and modesty.† They wrote again a few days after at greater length, extolling the character and teaching of Cartwright. "Here is a man whose life is one example of piety, of whom the more we see the more we love him; who has escaped from the vast and shoreless sea of papistical heresies without striking upon the rock of any of the vain opinions of the day: a man who is our defence not only against the waning fables of the Romanensians but against the malignant notions fabricated in foreign parts, which threaten us with greater calamity. His learning adds Greek to Latin, and Hebrew to both. If in one or other of

\* June 29. Cecil to the Heads.—Strype, *Ann.* i. 625. The Heads to Cecil.—*Ib.* and *State Pap. Dom.* lxxi. 27; *Cal. Dom.*, p. 382. The latter letter contains the account of the tumult in the Regents' House. It was written by May in the presence of the old Heads, Perne, Hawford, Hervey, and Ithel.

† This letter has no date, but probably was about the end of June. It is mistakenly described in the *Domestic Calendar* as a vindication of themselves by the writers; that they "have taken no part with Mr. Cartwright relative to the question of apparel, but have conducted themselves with due moderation and caution" (p. 383). Strype has given it subscribed with the names of fifteen. They say that they were present at his lectures: "de vestibis controversiam ne attigisse quidem: de ministerio proposuisse quædam, quorum ad amussim nostrum hoc formari cupiebat, sed ea et cautione et moderatione, quæ illum debebant merito tueri, et ab ista quæ circumfertur calumnia vindicare."—*Ann.* ii. 2.

these branches he have equals, in the whole he has no superior. In theology let his ability be judged by the crowd that frequents his lectures, hangs upon his words, gives to his sentence the applause of conviction and assent. Preserve, O Chancellor, to thy academy her chiefest ornament. Through all his life he has been our glory, but now he is more than ever our glory. The foreign exiles hesitate not to rank him with their greatest, even among the most famous names in the world. We are but few: but we speak with the voice of a multitude." They were however near twenty; among them the Regius Professor of Greek, Doddington; the vigorous preacher, Greenham; Howland, afterwards Bishop of Peterborough; and Still, afterwards Bishop of Bristol, who was destined to succeed in the Margaret Lecture the man whom now he sought to retain to it.\* As to that they said of the vestiarly controversy untouched in Cartwright's prelections, he was not accused by Grindal of touching it, but of himself nonconforming in his vesture and apparel. And this it is like enough that he did.

Nor was Cartwright wanting to himself at this juncture, while Cecil was still pondering the case. In an elegant epistle he protested to the minister his dislike of strife and contention: that in his lectures he had never taught aught that flowed not spontaneously from the context whereof he treated: that so far from entering into the vestiarly controversy he had pretermitted it when it came in his way: that though he denied not that he had taught the ministry of the Church of England to have declined from apostolical antiquity,† yet he had done this in so gentle, so sedate

\* 3 July.—Strype, *Ann.* i. 586; cf. *Cal. Dom.* 383 (No. 35).

† "Oblatam etiam de vestibis occasionem prætereundo dissimulasse.



a manner that only ignorance or malice could find fault. "So," said he, "I send you the testimony of a great many honest men who heard me. I could almost have sent you the testimony of the whole academy. For if the Vice-chancellor had not refused to allow me to call a public meeting,\* I doubt not that the whole academy would have pronounced itself against these calumnies." But in the same interval the perplexed Chancellor heard the whisper of the other voice. "Cartwright hath a busy head," said Grindal.† He attempted, without success, to mediate. He wrote to Cartwright requiring him to abstain for the present in his lectures from arguments that might stir strife: and Cartwright made him a promise of compliance. He sent to Cambridge a missive in which he acknowledged his doubts, refused not to allow the merits of the Reader in Divinity, but left his case to the decision of the Heads. "A novelty is lately happened in the University: which is the entry of Mr. Cartwright the Reader into some new observations of the errors in the ministry of the Church, taxing such ministers, archbishops and such like, as he findeth not expressly named in the New Testament. How far he went,

Non nego quin docuerim ministerium nostrum ab avitæ et Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ ministerio deflexisse: cujus ad puritatem nostram exigi et efformari cupiebam." Cartwright to Cecil, July 9.—Strype, ii. App. I, or iv. 411 (App. I). Cf. Paget's *Hooker*, p. 32.

\* "Nisi mihi roganti Vicecancellarius concionem cogere abnuisset."—Strype, *ib.*

† Grindal proposed greater severity than was exercised. "Cambridge Scholars. In the business moved by Dr. Yongman of Cambridge, my Lord of Canterbury shall be able to ease you well. Mine opinion, as I have written unto ye before, that they are only to be bridled by authority, and if they do not revoke their fastidious assertions let them be expelled your University for terror to others. And although Cartwright would revoke, he is never to be permitted to read again in the University: for he hath a busy head, stuffed full of singularities." Grindal to Cecil, Westminster, July 27.—*State Pap. Dom. Eliz.* lxxi. 58; *Cal. Dom.* 385.

I cannot tell: he has sent me a testimonial of himself, and others have sent me a testimonial of him: and others have sent me a testimonial of another sort. But he seems not to have been moved by arrogance or contention; but, as Reader of the Scriptures, to give notes by way of comparison between the order of the ministry in the times of the Apostles and at the present time in the Church of England. I leave it to your wisdoms.\* The Heads at once suspended Cartwright from reading, the suspension carrying with it subtraction of stipend; and notified to the Chancellor that they had done so.† On the same day another vigorous memorial, subscribed by Cartwright's friends to the number now of more than twenty, flew to London, protested against the sentence of the Heads, lamented the hopes which had been both raised and

\* It is in this letter Cecil says that he had requested Cartwright not to deal further in those questions until Michaelmas term: and that Cartwright had agreed. He further requests that no argument may be held on the contrary part, to provoke altercation. The further determination he leaves to them. Cecil to the Vice-chancellor and Heads, August 3.—*Strype*, i. 586; *Cal. Dom.* 387. The Heads took no heed of any agreement between the Chancellor and the Reader. Afterwards, when Cartwright referred to it in the proceedings that led to his deprivation, they still passed it over; perhaps regarding it as a thing that they could not recognise.

† "We have thought it very convenient and necessary to stay Mr. Cartwright from reading, both for the contagiousness of the time and the absence of divers of his auditors, and also lest his admittance to read again, being once by the Vice-chancellor and Heads inhibited (without some satisfaction), might seem to give authority and credit to his new opinions, which we take not only to be untrue but also dangerous and very inconvenient for the sake of this Church of England, as your Honour shall more at large understand when the rest of our company be returned. In the meantime we beseech your Honour not to let anything be done which may tend to the encouragement of such as would be commonly authors of strange opinions and new devices." Hawford, Whitgift, and Harvey to Cecil, Aug. 11, 1570, Cambridge. They only signed it, as "the rest of the Heads of colleges were then almost all from home."—*State Pap. Dom. Eliz.* lxxiii. 11; *Cal. Dom.*, p. 388.

disappointed by the Chancellor's letter, and besought of him the restitution of the reader.\*

The expostulation of his friends was supported, as before, by Cartwright himself in an elaborate epistle to Cecil. "I am no innovator: neither am I to be affrighted from the truth by the invidious charge of novelty. I need not plead in defence of novelty in a cause that is fifteen hundred and seventy years old. You, O Chancellor, are not of those who shout out proverbs against any who innovates in anything, whatsoever it may be. You can match them with another proverb, that old laws grow stale. The Heads deny me the freedom of public reading, notwithstanding the compact that I made with you. Pray recall the cause to yourself. If you deny your ability, and plead your infinite business, I reply that this cause would bring forth the rare light of your understanding and the divine endowments of your mind: this cause would again, in recompense of your labour, embrace you,

\* Aldrich and twenty-one others to Cecil, Cambridge, August 11.—*Strype*, ii. App. 3, or iv. 415 (App. iii): cf. *Cal. Dom.*, p. 388. If eight of the eighteen who signed the former protestation were absent from the latter (namely, Pacht, Lynford, David, Swone, Howland, Joy, Still, Doddington), their places were filled by twelve new names (namely, Sherwood, Rog. Brown, Rhodes, Chapman, Booth, Tabor, Moore, Barbar, Knewstub, Leach, Willan, Slater), some of whom were noted afterwards (as Moore the Apostle of Norwich and Barbar a minister in the Wandsworth Presbytery), while there are ten whose names are found in both (Aldrich, Par, Buck, Tower, Soome, Alen, Holland, Sherbroke, Grenham, Buck), some of whom afterwards changed their opinion: as, Grenham, who found that it was not good to entertain young men who came to study divinity with diatribes on the evils of the existing polity. This latter protestation is very creditable to the writers: in fact it is a model of skill and courtesy. It purposely exaggerates the expressions favourable to Cartwright which Cecil had used, passes over his demission of the case to the Heads, and is sure that when a surprising calamity comes to his knowledge he will sweep it away. "Est quidem nobis valde jucundum, quod bene tibi de eo persuaderi passus es: cui si hoc etiam addideris, ut illius doctrinam regustemus, qua jamdiu magno cum dolore caruimus, ultra tibi in hoc negotio, nisi quod urgeat vehementius, molesti non erimus," &c.



render you even more honourable than you are, revive and refresh you, however oppressed with the cares of state, and uphold you with mighty supports. This can I dare to promise you."\* Here may be heard the accents of the enthusiasm and experience of a scholar.

The following day the Chancellor received an admonishment opposite to this from Cambridge. "I think your Honour doth not fully understand Mr. Cartwright's opinions. And therefore I have set them down, as he hath uttered them to me in private conference, and also taught openly: that there be no archbishops, archdeacons, deans, chancellors; that the office of bishop and deacon, as they be now, are not to be allowed; equality of all ministers; every one to be chief in his own cure; none without cure, and none to preach out of his cure; all to be chosen by the people; and that the order of calling and making ministers now used is extraordinary, and to be altered." It was Whitgift, the real antagonist of Cartwright, the Master of the great college of Trinity, of which Cartwright was a fellow, a predecessor of Cartwright in the Margaret Lecture, not more than five years older than Cartwright, and a man of extraordinary eloquence, energy, and acuteness, who wrote this. He added, that which Cartwright cannot have known, that he had received the Chancellor's approbation of the suspension. "I have received your letter, and have signified to the others who also wrote unto your Honour, your contentation with our doings touching Mr. Cartwright."† It was indeed he who animated

\* Cartwright to Cecil, August 18.—Strype, ii. 4.

† Whitgift to Cecil, August 19.—Strype's *Whitgift*, Bk. i, App. No. 8 p. 9. No man has aroused the anger of the modern popular historians more than Whitgift. Macaulay says of him, speaking of this time, when he was Master of Trinity, that he was "a narrow-minded, mean, and

the Vice-chancellor May and the graver Heads against the reader, and had brought the proceedings to a point. But this was only part of a fuller design, in which he had engaged them, to curb the rashness of the younger sort by new or revised statutes: a design on which they had laboured for some months, and of which he now submitted the draft to the Chancellor and to Archbishop Parker. These statutes were enacted at the beginning of the Michaelmas term ensuing, when Whitgift himself was elected Vice-chancellor. The Nonconformists then found themselves checked both by stringent constitutions and the hand of a strong governor. They chafed extremely. A hot meeting was held in Queen's, where one of the supporters of Cartwright among the fellows inveighed against the new statutes, and said that princes might be deceived by hypocrites and flatterers as David was deceived by Shebna.\* A fellow of Christ's denounced Perne, Harvey, Ithel, Chaderton, May, and Whitgift

tyrannical priest, who gained power by servility and adulation, and employed it in persecuting both those who agreed with Calvin about Church-Government, and those who differed from Calvin touching the doctrine of Reprobation. He was now in a chrysalis state, putting off the worm and putting on the dragon-fly, a kind of intermediate grub between sycophant and oppressor. He was indemnifying himself for the court which he found it expedient to pay to the Ministers by exercising much petty tyranny within his own college." It is fair to say that when Macaulay was betrayed into this ebullition, he was not writing history. It is from the *Essay on Bacon*.—*Essays*, ii. 296, ed. 1843. Mr. Froude remarks, in his *History*, "Of all types of human beings who were generated by the Reformation, men like Whitgift are the least interesting." These are Eastern modes of expression signifying that Whitgift was a prelate of the Church of England.

\* Perhaps he meant Ziba. Chaderton, the President, called the fellows together by the Vice-chancellor's mandate, and warned them not to speak against the new statutes. Rockery, whose name has been seen among Cartwright's supporters, made this violent speech about them. He was cited before the Vice-chancellor for it, and required to recant in the same place: he refused, and was ordered to keep his chamber.—Cooper's *Athen. Cantabr.* ii. 242.

to the Chancellor: describing the last as a man of froward mind and sick conscience, "whose affections ruled him, and not his learning when he framed his cogitations to get more statutes."\* It was not now so easy as it had been to march into chapel without surplice, and nonconform there in all convenient ways. As to Cartwright, he continued in Trinity to be the head of all the refractory; and the opposition between him and the Master grew bitter. Whitgift called upon him several times for conference or conversation, but made nothing of it. Each of them challenged the other to a disputation: but neither would accept the terms of the other, and each taunted the other with declining the combat.† Whitgift expelled him the college, on an accusation of sedition, that he never was quiet, and was captain and ringleader of unquietness in others. Cartwright appealed to Cecil.‡ Whitgift sent Cecil a long list of Cartwright's positions upon episcopacy, and other his opinions; and informed him that he intended to deprive him of his readership.§

\* This was Deering.—Strype's *Whitgift*, p. 19.

† Whitgift offered Cartwright a public disputation provided that it should be in writing. Cartwright refused: but offered Whitgift a verbal disputation on condition that he should know who were to be his opponents and judges. Whitgift accepted, but added that it must be held under a licence from the Queen or Council, as it was on matter contrary to the realm. There the matter stayed. It was put about in the University that Cartwright had challenged Whitgift, who had declined. Soon afterwards Whitgift and the Heads, on the occasion of Cartwright's deprivation, caused to be drawn up in his presence a testification of the exact facts, which was confirmed by a public notary. See it in *ib.*, p. 21. This stayed the rumour. There are bitter allusions to this matter in their subsequent controversies.

‡ Cartwright to Cecil, October 17. He complains that his expulsion was altogether arbitrary, done by Whitgift without the consent of the fellows: and that the real reason was that so long as he remained fellow the Master feared that he should not be safe and respected in his place.—*ib.*, p. 20.

§ Whitgift and the Heads to Cecil, Nov. 7. With "Mr. Cartwright's propositions of the doctrines taught by him relating to Episcopal Juris-



He carried out this intention some weeks later with due form in a meeting of Heads, held within the Master's Lodge of Trinity, to which Cartwright was cited. He charged the reader with teaching contrary to the received religion and the admonitions already given him, and required his absolute answer, whether he would teach otherwise, revoking that which he had taught, or would still maintain it. He exhibited six Articles about the Ministry subscribed by Cartwright's hand: "Are these your own, and will you revoke or defend them?" "I will defend them as truth," said Cartwright. He then requested him to retire a space, the better to consider with himself: and at his return, perceiving him in the same mind, pronounced him deprived of his readership, and further, by virtue of his office of Vice-chancellor, inhibited him from preaching within the University.\* Cartwright however continued to hold his fellowship for a year or two longer.

Cartwright's honesty in using the trust of the Margaret Lecture against the allowed order of the Church has been questioned, and may be questionable.† But at least he was not the first perhaps, certainly not the last man of religion and conscience who has used a trust curiously, even the trust of a lecture: and it must be remembered that the Nonconformists held

diction, the functions of the Ministry," &c., six in number.—*Cal. Dom.*, p. 395. There is also a list of twenty-six propositions, including the foregoing six, p. 396.

\* December 11. See the proceedings in full, Strype's *Whitgift*, App. i. No. ix.

† Mr. Cooper speaks of his "reprehensible conduct in abusing the powers of his office."—*Athen. Cantabr.*, ii. p. 360. Bishop Paget gently remarks that "It seems an indefensible use of a great trust that as soon as he was appointed Lady Margaret Professor he set himself to advocate the Puritan plan for reforming the government of the Church."—Introd. to *Hooker*, p. 28.

themselves as free to press the Reformation further than the settlement of the Conformists as the Conformists to stand on it. As to his opinions or propositions, they were almost anarchical. Away went archbishops, archdeacons, and every other dignitary, under the principle of no office to be allowed that is not named in the Bible. Away went the names of bishops and deacons, save in so far as they might be applied to the service of the word and the service of tables. Away, it would appear, went dioceses, and every other territorial division; since there was to be nothing but cures, the minister of each of which was to keep wholly to it, and never preach outside of it. Such vigour passed beyond Presbyterianism. It went to Independency, and perhaps beyond it, and Cartwright was in advance of his generation. And yet there was a grain or two of sense in it. The election of ministers was bad; and ought to have been reformed. The lack of discipline in the Church was grievous, although it was not the fault of the clergy but of the laity, who, as it has been seen, evaded every attempt made throughout the Reformation to restore discipline. The disuse of diocesan synods, an old corruption, left clear an inviting space for attempting to construct other organism: and that the two Convocations, meeting only when it pleased the prince to summon Parliament, with irregular and enormous gaps of time, should be the only clerical assemblies, was an imperfection which bade zeal awake and mend it. The usual disposition to blame the clergy for everything would be felt with double force by one who was neither a layman nor a priest; and Cartwright was not in the order of priesthood.\* The rage to abolish dignities

\* It was for that reason that Whitgift deprived him of his fellowship, on the ground that it was contrary to the college statutes.

was partly inspired by the remembrance of the towering hierarchical degrees of the official system of the Papacy: to fence the Pope, to tax the nations. He challenged authority, and he felt the weight of it. Indignation has denounced the treatment that he received: but it was to stop him, not to punish him: compared with the doom that he would have met in any other country than England it was the quality of mercy. It cannot be said that there was hastiness in the measures that were taken with him, or that he was not afforded full opportunity of altering his course. The irritation of his adversaries was caused by the very obstinacy with which he resisted their persistent efforts to recall him. He suffered for his opinions: and he was willing to suffer. Unchangeable through life, unconvinced by the most powerful reasoning and the deepest learning, he clung to the imagination of that which could not exist, knowing not that he was but playing into the hands of the unscrupulous rapacity that hangs in the skirts of every great movement.\* A man may do or propose things which we dislike, and yet may bring to it a breath of the infinite truth which makes all great actions alike. Another may deserve our entire approbation without awakening any other emotion.

The conclusion of the twelfth year of the reign of Elizabeth was celebrated on the seventeenth day of November with public rejoicings. Thanksgivings and prayers, sermons, processions, pageants, and tournaments testified in an extraordinary manner to the good will of the people towards the Queen. She

\* So Whitgift himself remarked upon Cartwright's doctrine after he had deprived him: "that the doctrine was plausible, especially to such as were delighted with the spoils of the Church." Whitgift to Parker, December 29.—Strype's *Whitgift*, p. 20.



had survived the term appointed for her death by the sentence of astrologers, magicians, and necromancers of every hue, and the credulity of many of her abused subjects. It was observed that the year had not brought forth "the golden day" expected in the Northern rebellion, the triumph of her adversaries in the consummation of her ruin; that it still continued her successful annals. She had good cause to own the hand of Providence. She had been enabled to preserve her people in peace, whilst all Europe besides was convulsed by the Counter-reformation. She saw the nations around betrayed by their princes, and all partaking an adverse fate, and she needed not to cross the seas for the spectacle. She saw the Scottish Reformation drag the most sorely tested of monarchies into one of the bitterest struggles of the age: she had received the outcast of Scotland into the bosom of her kingdom. To moderate that tremendous eruption no preparation had been made, as in England by the dissolution of monasteries. Abbots and priors stood beside bishops in the struggle, and disappeared with them in the defeat of the old religion: the opposed systems were ranged in unimpaired completeness to fight against one another: they fought till one was dispossessed and banished in open civil war. In England, on the contrary, the old had slidden into the new: it had been needful only to resume the former measures, the line taken by predecessors; and the Queen had witnessed the gradual decay of opposition. When the Pope hurled his thunderbolt, she could feel with indifference that she had taken the best course for England, point with confidence to the mingled leniency and resolution of her sway, and stand unmoved in the face of Europe with her people at her back. As

to the Nonconformists, they were part of the Church : they strove still to enclose themselves therein : if they had already incurred some penalties through her policy, she had successfully kept herself out of their sight : she never lectured them, she lectured the bishops, and upon the bishops she had skilfully turned their anger. Her troubles were most to come ; whether from Scotland, from the Papacy, or from the Puritans. But with the troubles were being born the remedies of the troubles. At this time she carried her life in her hands through the dangerous plots that were thickening round her, and yet she felt herself safe. The tender admiration of mankind which first greeted her, which delights in the manifestation of strength of will, endures caprice, and pardons violence, had suffered no diminution since her accession to the throne, when now her subjects marked her epoch with solemnity. Henceforth it was annual : an anniversary which was kept to the end of her long reign.

# INDEX

## TO VOLUMES V AND VI.

- ABBOT, William, v. 145 *note*.  
 "Admonition," Elizabeth's, v. 138 *note*.  
 "Advertisements," Parker's, printed, vi. 102; *see Uniformity*.  
 Aless, Alexander, v. 267; and the Latin Prayer-book, v. 290.  
 Allen, Bishop Hugh, vi. 84.  
 ——— William, on the coronation, v. 48 *note*, 51 *note*.  
 Alley, Bishop W., consecration, v. 300; in Convocation, v. 386, 396.  
 All Hallows', Thames Street, Nonconformity, vi. 111.  
 All Souls College, Oxford, church ornaments, vi. 203.  
 Alnwick, Visitation at, v. 150.  
 Alott, William, his deposition against Elizabeth, vi. 256.  
 Altars, v. 175, 369.  
 Alva, on the plots against Elizabeth, vi. 228.  
 Ambassadors, and the exercise of religion, vi. 208 *seq*.  
 Anabaptists, v. 28; refugees, v. 356; vi. 181.  
 Anglican Church, catholicity, v. 321; authority in rites, v. 40".  
 Anglo-Saxon literature, Parker's work, v. 354.  
 Anointing at coronation, v. 51 *note*.  
 Apocrypha, the English Article on, v. 406.  
 Appeals to Rome, v. 60, 252.  
 Appropriation, Parker's code of uniformity, vi. 53.  
 Aquila, Bishop of, *see Quadra*.  
 Aquinas, St. Thomas, and *intention*, v. 234 *note*.  
 Arau, exiles from, v. 34, 36, 37.  
 Archdeacons' visitations, vi. 50.  
 Arches, Court of, v. 31, 32 *note*, 341.  
 Arden, at Hereford, v. 345, 346.  
 Arians, v. 28.  
 Armagh Cathedral burned, v. 363; election of Archbishop, v. 361, 363.  
 Arran, Earl of, and Elizabeth, v. 256.  
 Articles, the Thirty-nine, proposed for Westminster Disputation, v. 75  
*note*; in Convocation of 1559, v. 90; of the Visitation of 1559, v. 139;  
 of Parker's Visitation, v. 342; drafted, v. 391 *seq*.; the MSS., v. 393;  
 published, v. 393; style, v. 394 *seq*., 404; the Forty-two, v. 393 *seq*.;  
 the Forty-five, v. 393 *seq*.; of Bentham's Visitation, vi. 77 *seq*.;  
 exhibited by the Dutch Church, vi. 185 *seq*.; of the Norwich Visitation,  
 vi. 194; of the Canterbury Visitation, vi. 197; of the Process against  
 Elizabeth, vi. 251; propounded by Cartwright, vi. 285.  
 Arundel, Lord, v. 25, 117.  
 Assurance of Supremacy Bill, v. 377.



- Atkins, Antony, deprived, v. 172.  
 Atkinson, Robert, M.P., speech on the Supremacy Bill, v. 380.  
 ——— Thomas, v. 149 *note*, 151 *note*, 153 *note*.  
 Attainders reversed by Mary, v. 29 *note*.  
 Atterbury, Margaret, released, v. 33.  
 Auckland, Visitation at, v. 147.  
 Audience, Court of, v. 341.  
 Augmentations, Court of, v. 54.  
 Austin, John, v. 151 *note*.  
 Austin Friars' church, v. 18, 19 *note*, 268.  
 Aylmer, Dr. John, v. 77, 78, 85, 265.
- BABHAM, proctor, v. 32 *note*.  
 Bacon, Lady, translates the *Apology*, v. 320.  
 ——— Sir Nicolas, v. 53, 77, 81 *seq.*, 117; appointed Lord Keeper, v. 25;  
     on the Assurance of Supremacy Bill, v. 382; threatened disgrace,  
     vi. 36; and simony, vi. 193.  
 Baines, Bishop R., v. 4, 77, 82-5, 88, 89, 96, 181, 185; and the oath, v.  
     120; deprived, v. 121.  
 Baker, Dr. Philip, at the Cambridge disputations, vi. 17; flies to Louvain,  
     vi. 206.  
 Baldwin, Richard, v. 152 *note*.  
 Bale, John, Bishop of Ossory, v. 202; and Parker, v. 353.  
 Ball, William, v. 149 *note*.  
 Bangor diocese, Visitation, vi. 196.  
 Bapthorpe, Robert, v. 146 *note*.  
 Baptism, rites, v. 388, 389; Article on, v. 398; Nonconformist usage, vi. 6;  
     by women, vi. 133, 156, 160; dissension about, in Dutch Church, vi. 184.  
 Barker, Christopher, printer of the Bible, v. 331.  
 Barlow, Dr. W., v. 192, 199, 202, 205, 257; bishop-elect of Chichester, v.  
     123 *note*, 199; and the plundered sees, v. 189; and Parker's conse-  
     cration, v. 213 *note*, 215, 247; his claim to be a bishop, v. 216 *seq.*;  
     his *Dialogue*, v. 221 *note*.  
 Barthlett, John, lecturer, suspended, vi. 107, 121; Nonconformist agent, vi.  
     134, 155 *seq.*  
 "Bartholomean era," v. 164.  
 Basle exiles, v. 36.  
 Bath and Wells, temporalities, v. 303.  
 Baxter, Richard, on lay readers, v. 196 *note*.  
 Beads, use of, vi. 79 *note*.  
 Beaumont, Dr. R., Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, and uniformity, vi. 68,  
     75, 89.  
 Becket, Thomas, his image, v. 45, 46 *note*.  
 Becon, Thomas, v. 129 *note*; a Visitor, v. 165; in Convocation, v. 384.  
 Bedford, Earl of, v. 22, 36, 41, 117; sworn of the Council, v. 25; Spanish  
     pension, v. 44; embassy to France, v. 293, 296; and the Papal  
     nuncio, v. 293.  
 Bedingfield, Sir Henry, v. 25.

- Bellarmino on *intention*, v. 235 *note*.  
 Bells for the dead, vi. 79, 80 *note*.  
 Benhere, Augustinus, v. 168 *note*.  
 Bennet, William, v. 148 *note*, 149 *note*.  
 Benson, Nonconformist minister, vi. 177.  
 Bent, Robert, v. 147 *note*.  
 Bentham, Thomas, reformer, v. 13; a Visitor, v. 129 *note*, 167; consecrated Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, v. 300, 302; and Nonconformity, vi. 77.  
 Berkeley, Bishop Gilbert, v. 302.  
 Best, James, v. 146 *note*.  
 ——— John, consecrated Bishop, v. 301; and the Visitation of 1561, v. 343, 344.  
 Bevan, Thomas, v. 152 *note*.  
 Beverley, Visitation at, v. 146.  
 Beynton parish, v. 147 *note*.  
 Beza, and the English Nonconformists, vi. 129 *seq.*, 159 *seq.*; his letter to Grindal, vi. 161 *seq.*, 169, 170; and the Dutch Church, vi. 185.  
 Bible, Genevan version, v. 34-5, 36, 329 *seq.*; Welsh translation, v. 375; the "Bishops'" issued, vi. 248.  
 Bibles burnt, v. 140, 143.  
 Bill, Dr. W., v. 3, 5, 21, 98, 123 *note*, 169, 313; sermon at Paul's Cross, v. 89.  
 Bindley, John, v. 149 *note*.  
 Binny, William, v. 152 *note*.  
 Bird, Richard, v. 146 *note*.  
 Bishopricks, vacant, revenues, v. 31, 55; filled, v. 300.  
 Bishops, English, greet Elizabeth, v. 3; breach with Elizabeth, v. 12, 16, 20, 47, 52; opposition, v. 23; to be restrained, v. 28 *note*, 29; Fox's charges against, v. 36 *note*; and the coronation, v. 47, 48 *note*; and Elizabeth's succession, v. 54 *and note*; at the Westminster Disputation, v. 77 *seq.*; popular opinion of, v. 86 *note*; after the Westminster Disputation, v. 87-9; Bill for consecrating, v. 94, 202; in the Commons, v. 95; deprived, v. 97, 121; and the Oath of Supremacy, v. 116; their courage, v. 183 *note*; elections, v. 198; consecration under Henry VIII, v. 216 *seq.*; jurisdiction, v. 240; imprisoned, v. 306 *seq.*, 338-9, 369, 412, 414 *seq.*; and marriage of the clergy, v. 310, 311; and church ornaments, v. 311; in the Parliament of 1563, v. 368; Irish, undisturbed, v. 364; Romanensian, and the Anglican Church, v. 420.  
 Bishops' temporalities, v. 95-6; conveyances, v. 55 *note*, 303, 338-9, 385; plundered, v. 187; survey, v. 189, 191; Bill, v. 375; and the Nonconformists, vi. 1 *note*, 3, 91; criticized by the Council, vi. 198; Consecration Act of 1566, vi. 146; temporalities, in Ireland, vi. 84.  
 Black Rubric, v. 106.  
 Blake, Antony, v. 145 *note*.  
 Blaxton, at Hereford, v. 345, 346.  
 Blenkinsop, Robert, v. 149 *note*.  
 Blunston, Robert, v. 147.

- Blythe, Visitation at, v. 144.  
 Bodley, John, and the Geneva Bible, v. 331, 332 *note*.  
 Boleyn, Anne, and Matthew Parker, v. 39.  
 Bonham, licensed preacher, vi. 173, 174.  
 Bonner, Bishop, v. 4, 49 *note*, 50 *note*, 55, 89-91, 97 *note*, 116, 181, 419 ;  
 and heresy commissions, v. 32 ; in the Commons, v. 96 ; and the oath,  
 v. 119 ; vi. 29-36.  
 Books, seditious, seized, vi. 121 *seq*.  
 Bourne, Bishop, v. 119, 181, 199, 200 *note*, 418 ; deprived, v. 122 ; his  
 temporalities, v. 303 ; imprisoned, v. 306 *seq*.  
 Bowes, v. 129 *note*.  
 Bowland, Nonconformist minister, vi. 177.  
 Boxall, Dr., v. 25, 41, 418 *note*, 419 ; on the Communion, v. 105 ; im-  
 prisoned, v. 307 ; in Parker's house, vi. 20.  
 Boyes, William, v. 146 *note*.  
 Brady, Bishop Hugh, vi. 85.  
 Brandling, R., v. 151 *note*.  
 Breen, Mr., on Barlow's non-consecration, v. 218 *note*.  
 Bridgett, Mr., on Elizabethan victims, v. 178 *note*, 182 *note*.  
 Bridlington parish, v. 147 *note*.  
*Brief Discourse* of the Nonconformists, vi. 116, 124.  
 Bristow, Richard, at Oxford, vi. 141, 145.  
 Britton, Thomas, v. 147 *note*.  
 Bromborough, Dr., his deposition against Elizabeth, vi. 256.  
 Browne, Archbishop, consecration, v. 206 *note*.  
 ——— Sir George, v. 129 *note*, 151.  
 ——— John, v. 149 *note*.  
 Bucer, Martin, vi. 25 ; on vestments, vi. 56 *note*.  
 Buke, John, v. 12.  
*Bull of Reconcilement*, vi. 218.  
 — of the deposition of Elizabeth, vi. 262 ; in England, vi. 270.  
 Bullinger, and Conformity, v. 127 *note* ; and vestments, v. 176, 177 *note* ;  
 vi. 120 ; and the Nonconformists, vi. 127 *seq.*, 159, 160 ; his letter,  
 vi. 128, 153, 169 ; his *Refutation of a Papistical Bull*, vi. 275.  
 Bullingham, Bishop, consecration, v. 300 ; character, v. 302 ; and Non-  
 conformity, vi. 101 ; and the foreign immigrants, vi. 183 ; his  
 marriage, vi. 254 ; his orders, vi. 256, 259.  
 Bullock, George, v. 148 *note*, 149 *note*.  
 Bury, prisoners at, v. 33 ; Visitation, v. 154.  
 Button, Nonconformist minister, vi. 177.
- CALENDARS in the Prayer-book, v. 289-90, 348.  
 Calfhill, John, v. 173, 384 ; on lay readers, v. 195 *note* ; sermon at Paul's  
 Cross, v. 314 ; his sermon before the Queen, vi. 8 ; on tyrannicide,  
 vi. 141 ; his play of *Tereus and Progne*, vi. 144.  
 Calvin and Knox's *First Blast*, v. 264.  
 Cambridge University, Visitation, v. 169, 170 *note* ; Elizabeth's visit,  
 vi. 10-7 ; certificate of ceremonial usages, vi. 48 ; preaching licenses,



- vi. 65 *seq.*; disorders at St. John's, vi. 69 *seq.*; enquiry of 1568, vi. 205 *seq.*
- Cambridge, Nonconformity in, vi. 283 *seq.*; the influence of Cartwright, vi. 284.
- Camden on the deprived clergy, v. 177, 178 *note.*
- Campion, Edmund, at Oxford, vi. 141.
- Canon, Scriptural, English Article on the, v. 406.
- Canterbury cathedral, certificate of usages, vi. 47.
- manor, v. 30; see, endowments, v. 30; in commission, v. 89; royal Visitation, v. 165; Parker's Visitation, v. 341; school, v. 424; diocese, survey of, 1569, vi. 200.
- Caps, use of, *see Hats.*
- Caraffa family, v. 254.
- Carew, Sir Peter, v. 19 *note.*
- Carlisle, Bishop of, *see Oglethorpe*; Visitation at, v. 151; diocese, absentees from Visitation, v. 155 *note.*
- Carter, William, v. 150, 151 *note.*
- Cartwright, Thomas, at the Cambridge disputations, vi. 16, 17; his attack on episcopacy, vi. 283 *seq.*; his reputation, vi. 284 *note*; suspended, vi. 289; expelled from Trinity, vi. 293.
- Cassander on church ornaments, v. 313.
- Catechism, Bentham's Articles, vi. 78 *note.*
- Catechizing, v. 386.
- Catharinus and *intention*, v. 234.
- Cathedrals and grammar schools, v. 424.
- Catholicorum Postulatio*, v. 430 *seq.*
- Catholics, English, law-abiding, v. 379.
- Cave, Sir Ambrose, Councillor, v. 25, 117; Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, v. 95.
- Cavenagh, Bishop, vi. 84.
- Cecil, Sir William, v. 41, 42, 54 *note*, 117, 169; at Elizabeth's accession, v. 2; appointed Secretary, v. 3, 25; Spanish pension, v. 44; and the Prayer Book, v. 99 *seq.*; and the Injunctions, v. 131; and Elizabeth's marriage, v. 256; and the word 'Protestant,' v. 262; and the Council, v. 296 *seq.*; and the married clergy, v. 309; and the Visitation of 1561, v. 343; and Parker, v. 353; on the Assurance of Supremacy Bill, v. 381; and the Supremacy Oath, v. 414; and the Nonconformists, vi. 3, 76; his position threatened, vi. 36; and the code of uniformity, vi. 51, 56; and Cambridge University, vi. 68 *seq.*; his policy, vi. 92; his answers to the Bull of Excommunication, vi. 276-7.
- Certificates of ceremonial usages, vi. 47-8.
- Chalices, use of, v. 194 *note.*
- Champney, Dr., on Parker's consecration, v. 214 *note*; on Barlow's non-consecration, v. 217 *note.*
- Chancels, repair, v. 348.
- Chapel Royal, ritual, v. 5, 14-6, 24 *note*, 97, 173; ornaments, v. 308, 313; sermons, v. 314.
- Chapels of ease, v. 423 *note.*

- Charles, Archduke, and Elizabeth, v. 252 *note*, 255.  
 Charterhouse, v. 57.  
 Chauncey, Prior, v. 179.  
 Chedsey, Archdeacon, v. 77, 78, 85, 88, 90; imprisoned, v. 306.  
 Chester, Bishop of, *see Scot*.  
 — Visitation at, v. 154; diocese, Visitation of, v. 152; absentees from Visitation, v. 155 *note*.  
 Chesters, Sir William, v. 193.  
 Cheyney, Bishop Richard, consecration, v. 300; and the Articles, v. 392 *note*.  
 — Sir Thomas, v. 25.  
 Chichester diocese, Visitation, v. 165; survey of 1569, vi. 200, 201.  
 Cholmeley, Sir Roger, v. 54 *note*.  
 Christopherson, Bishop, v. 4, 5, 6 *note*, 12.  
 Church, non-attendance at, v. 62.  
 Church ornaments, v. 64, 101, 308, 311 *seq.*; rubric, v. 99; in houses, v. 139, 147 *note*; at St. Paul's, v. 159, 163; burnt, v. 163; in the Chapel Royal, v. 173; inventories, v. 160 *note*, 162; the Queen's speech, 1563, v. 369 (*cp. Vestments*).  
 Church services, language, v. 14, 27 *note*, 28; in English, v. 45, 50, 52.  
 Churches, decay of, v. 133 *note*, 143, 348.  
 Church-going of Catholics, v. 429.  
 Churchwardens at the Visitation, v. 142.  
 Clark, Bartholomew, and Nonconformity, vi. 76.  
 Clenock, Maurice, his deposition against Elizabeth, vi. 254.  
 Clergy, plunder of, proposed, v. 21, 23; marriage, v. 28 *note*, 32 *note*, 134, 135, 142, 144, 145, 146 *note*, 148, 308 *seq.*; Uniformity Act, v. 61; deprived, their fate, v. 180-6; lack of, v. 194; ordinations under Parker, v. 302; disaffected, recalcitrant, v. 304; taxed to repair St. Paul's, v. 332-3; stipends, v. 375-6, 390; and the Supremacy Oath, v. 378, 412 *seq.*; taxes for, v. 387; education, *see Education*.  
 Cliffe, George, v. 149 *note*.  
 Clinton, Lord, v. 25, 68, 117; Spanish pension, v. 44.  
 Cockermouth parish, v. 153 *note*.  
 Colchester Castle, prisoners, v. 32.  
 Cole, Henry, Dean of St. Paul's, v. 77, 79, 80 *note*, 82, 85, 88 *seq.*; imprisoned, v. 307; controversy with Jewel, v. 315 *seq.*  
 — Robert, Rector of St. Mary le Bow, vi. 95; and the Geneva Bible, v. 330.  
 — Thomas, Archdeacon of Essex, on vestments, vi. 101.  
 — William, President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, vi. 203.  
 Colleges, Heads of, deprived, v. 169.  
 Collins, Robert, v. 166 *note*.  
 Columbell, R., v. 161 *note*.  
 Columben, Oliver, v. 145 *note*.  
 Commandments on church walls, vi. 78.  
 Committees of Council formed, v. 25.  
 Communion, division, v. 101; service, Bishop Scot on, v. 103; the Evangelics' Declaration, v. 107-16; substituted for Mass, v. 134 (*cp.*

- Communion*); table, v. 134, 136; in funeral service, v. 291; in the *Apology* controversy, v. 324; doctrine of the, Dorman's views, vi. 27; tables, vi. 27, 47, 49 *note*, 77 *note*, 253; service, vi. 52, 71, 78 *note*, 253; its frequency, vi. 80; cups, vi. 195 *note*.
- Condé and Elizabeth, v. 365, 366.
- Conference of exiles, proposed, v. 36-8.
- Confession, v. 133.
- Conformity, of the Evangelicals, v. 125 *seq.*; of Romanensians, v. 127; vi. 216, 266; of Mary Q. of Scots, vi. 225, 229; declaration demanded of J.P.'s, vi. 247; character of Elizabethan, vi. 277, 280 (*cp. Uniformity*).
- Congé d'élire* under Elizabeth, v. 198.
- Consecration, of prelates, v. 94, 199 *seq.*; of Parker, v. 199 *seq.*; Romanist objections, v. 206; under Hen. VIII, v. 216 *seq.*; Roman Catholic theory, v. 225 *note*; jurisdiction, v. 240; in the *Apology* controversy, v. 323; in the Mass, in the *Apology* controversy, v. 324; Act of 1566, vi. 146; the Roman Process, vi. 260.
- Convocation of 1559, v. 89; Articles composed by Lower House, v. 90; and Parliament, v. 91-3; protest, its Articles, v. 92; of 1563, proceedings, v. 382 *seq.*
- Cook, Sir Antony, v. 34, 54 *note*.
- Coortesse, Richard, and the Nonconformists, vi. 72, 74-5.
- Copes sold at St. John's College, Cambridge, vi. 71.
- Cornwallis, Sir Thomas, v. 24.
- Coronation of Elizabeth, v. 47; pardons at, v. 28 *note*, 29.
- Corpus Christi Feast, v. 107.
- Corranus, Spanish minister, vi. 183.
- Counter-reformation in Europe, v. 278.
- Cousin, French minister, vi. 183.
- Coutances, Bishop of, in England, vi. 18-20.
- Coventry, Bishop of, v. 55.
- Coverdale, Miles, v. 34, 37, 202, 205; and Parker's consecration, v. 225, 241; consecration, v. 238, 240; absent from Lambeth, vi. 106; and the Genevan ministers, vi. 129; and the Nonconformists, vi. 168.
- Cox, Bishop, v. 21, 34, 52, 53 *note*, 77, 81 *note*, 98, 123 *note*, 193; sermons, v. 57, 314; and the Prayer Book, v. 125; and the Chapel Royal, v. 173; and the plundered sees, v. 189, 190; consecration, v. 300; his learning, v. 301; and the married clergy, v. 310, 311; and church ornaments, v. 311, 312, 313; and Nonconformity, vi. 76, 99, 100; and Watson, vi. 81.
- Craig, John, Knox's assistant, v. 276.
- Craike, Bishop of Kildare, vi. 84.
- Cramp, Christian, released, v. 32.
- Crane, licensed preacher, vi. 173, 174.
- Cranmer, his laxity, v. 219; his Register, v. 217 *and note*; on consecration, v. 220 *note*; on the Sacrament, v. 340; Parker's appreciation, v. 355.
- Crawford, John, v. 148 *note*.



- Crawford, Richard, v. 152 *note*.  
 Creagh, Archbishop, sent to the Tower, vi. 81 *seq*.  
 Creed, in English, v. 14; in the Communion, v. 101.  
 Creeds, the English Article on, v. 410.  
 Crespin, Jean, martyrologist, v. 328 *note*, 329.  
 Crofts, Sir James, English Envoy, v. 129 *note*, 262, 263, 266.  
 Cross in churches, v. 100 (*cp. Church ornaments*); question of restoration, v. 311 *seq*.; in baptism, v. 388, 389; in the Royal Chapel, vi. 37, 210-1.  
 Crosthwaite chapelry, v. 153 *note*.  
 Crowley, Robert, Vicar of St. Giles', Cripplegate, his Nonconformity, vi. 107, 110, 170; his *Brief Discourse*, vi. 115 *seq*.  
 Croydon school, v. 424.  
 Crusade against Elizabeth planned, v. 427.  
 Cumberland, Visitation of 1561, v. 344; insurrection in, vi. 244-6.  
 Curates' duties, Parker's code of uniformity, vi. 50, 52.  
 Curwen, Archbishop, consecration, v. 364.
- DALLISON, Roger, v. 145 *note*.  
 Dalton, Robert, v. 148 *note*, 149 *note*.  
 Daniel, Edmund, Dean of Hereford, v. 15 *note*, 168; his deposition against Elizabeth, vi. 255.  
 Darbyshire, Dr., v. 159.  
 David, Bishop, vi. 83.  
 Davies, Richard, a Visitor, v. 129 *note*, 168; consecrated Bishop, v. 300, 302.  
 Davison, William, v. 147 *note*.  
 Dawkins, Dr., v. 152.  
 Day, Bishop, v. 97 *note*.  
 — John, and Parker, v. 353, 355 *note*.  
 — William, sermon before Convocation, v. 383.  
 Dead, prayer for, v. 101, 138, 257.  
 Declaration of Doctrine, v. 107, 116, 394.  
 Delegates, Court of, v. 194.  
 Denman, William, v. 147.  
 Deprivations, v. 129, 142, 144-56, 192; Bill concerning, v. 97; number, v. 155-6; 177-80; in Ireland, v. 365; under code of uniformity, vi. 53 *note*; their legality, vi. 59, 64, 89 *seq.*, 99; of Nonconformists, vi. 97, 98, 107, 153, 156.  
 Derby, Earl of, v. 25, 117, 129 *note*.  
*Device* for the alteration of religion, v. 20, 23, 25.  
 Dioceses, survey of, v. 422 *seq.*; vi. 199 *seq.*; of 1569, vi. 199 *seq*.  
 Dirge in Elizabeth's Primer, v. 257, 258.  
 Disarming of prelates, v. 28, 29.  
*Disciplinarians*, vi. 2.  
 Discipline, under Parker, v. 341 *seq.*, 347 *seq.*; the Queen's speech, 1563, v. 370; proceedings of Convocation, v. 385; Parker's code of uniformity, vi. 50 *seq*.

Dissent, under Uniformity Act, v. 62 ; Bishop Scot on, v. 69 ; *see Non-conformity*.

*Divers Points of Religion*, v. 25-8.

Dodds, ex-Dominican, in Convocation, v. 384.

Dodworth, John, v. 146 *note*.

Donellan, Nehemiah, and Irish printing, vi. 86.

Dorman, Thomas, v. 207 ; his *Proof*, vi. 27.

Dormer, Jane, v. 44 *note*.

Douglas, A., v. 151 *note*.

Dowdal, Archbishop, v. 363.

Downes, Dr. Geoffrey, v. 146 *note*.

Downham, Bishop, consecration, v. 301 ; his laxity, vi. 214.

Dreux, battle of, v. 365.

Drury, John, v. 145 *note*.

——— Dr., an assessor, vi. 112.

Dudley, Lord Robert, Spanish pension, v. 44 ; and the Council, v. 294.

Durham, Visitation at, v. 147 *seq.* ; diocese, Visitation of 1559, v. 147 ; absentees from Visitation, v. 155 *note* ; Visitation of 1561, v. 346 ; insurrection in, vi. 231 *seq.* ; Palatinate and the rebel estreats, vi. 240 ; trial of rebels, vi. 241 *seq.*

Dutch Church in Austin Friars, v. 268 ; dissension as to baptism, vi. 184 ; their Articles, vi. 185 *seq.*

——— refugees in London, v. 267 *seq.* ; list, v. 269 *seq.* ; in England, v. 279, 356 *seq.*

ECCLESIASTICAL courts, abuses, vi. 197 ; and the rebels, vi. 241 *seq.*

Edgecombe, Sir Richard, v. 13.

Edinburgh Assembly and the English bishops, vi. 134.

Edlington parish, v. 147 *note*.

Education, of clergy, v. 133 ; state of, v. 371, 423.

Edwards, Richard, poet, vi. 140.

Elections, of prelates, v. 26 *note* ; parliamentary, v. 54 *note*.

Elector Palatine and the English Nonconformists, vi. 157.

"Eleven Articles" promulgated, v. 349.

Elizabeth, Queen, proclaimed, v. 1 ; religious policy, v. 4-5, 17, 20 ; and ritual, v. 5, 97, 173 ; analysis of her prestige, v. 6 ; and Mass, v. 15, 107 ; and the Geneva Bible, v. 36 ; and the Spanish ambassador, v. 42, 43 ; suggested marriages, v. 42, 44, 252 *note*, 255, 256, 288 *note*, 373, 374, 382, 425 ; in London, v. 46 ; coronation, v. 47 ; her title, v. 55 ; proposed excommunication, v. 87 *note* ; and the bishops, v. 123 *note* ; on her powers under Uniformity Act, v. 138 *note* ; her policy, v. 175, 308, 366, 367 ; and the vacant sees, v. 189 ; illegitimacy, v. 251, 288 ; royal style, v. 255 ; and the Protestant princes, v. 260 ; and the Dutch refugees, v. 268, 356 ; her greatness, v. 275 ; and Scotland, v. 275 ; and Mary compared, v. 276 ; her patriotism, v. 278, 279, 366 ; and the Council, v. 284, 288, 293, 294, 296, 298, 299, 432 ; and education, v. 324 ; and the repair of St. Paul's, v. 333 ; and the Huguenots, v. 365, 366 ; opens Parliament, 1563, v. 368 ; and Parker, v. 413 ; and Church unity, v. 422 ;

- the Council of Trent upon, v. 427; and the Nonconformists, vi. 3; her progresses, vi. 10; at Cambridge, vi. 10-7; her Latin speech at Cambridge, vi. 15; and Parker's code of uniformity, vi. 51 *et seq.*; and Dean Nowell, vi. 86; and the Pope, vi. 88; and church vestments, vi. 101, 125; at Oxford, vi. 136 *seq.*; her oration at Oxford, vi. 143; marriage urged by the Commons in 1566, vi. 145, 146; her tact, vi. 146; and Mary of Scotland, vi. 223; her vengeance on the North, 1570, vi. 238; excommunicated, vi. 250; Process against her at Rome, vi. 251 *seq.*; her title of *Great*, vi. 276; her *Declaration* of policy, 1570, vi. 278; her proclamation concerning Religion, vi. 280; anniversary of her accession, vi. 296.
- Ely, at Hereford, v. 345.
- Cathedral, Parker's Visitation, v. 341; diocese, Visitation, v. 165; spiritual state, v. 341.
- Emerson, Oswald, v. 147 *note*.
- Enchantments, bill against, v. 375.
- English, church service in, v. 14, 73, 79, 257; and see *Prayer Book and Litany*.
- Episcopacy, Cartwright's attack, vi. 288, 291, 295.
- Erasmus' *Paraphrase*, v. 133.
- Erlond, v. 153 *note*.
- Essex, Visitation of, v. 160.
- Estcot, Commissioner for the North, 1559, v. 129 *note*.
- Ethell, Daniel, v. 153 *note*.
- Eucharist, Articles on, v. 399; use of the word, v. 401; see *Communion*.
- Eugenius IV, and ordination, v. 227; and jurisdiction, v. 242.
- Evangelicals, first called Puritans, vi. 1.
- Evangelics, at the accession of Elizabeth, v. 16; private services, v. 17; and the Italian Church, v. 18, 19 *note*; Declaration, v. 107; and the Prayer Book, v. 124; and the proposed Reform League, v. 260; in Convocation, v. 388, 411.
- Evers, Lord, v. 129 *note*, 148, 150, 346.
- Eversham parish, v. 153 *note*.
- Excommengement* in courts of law, v. 26 *note*.
- Excommunication, by the Archbishop, v. 26 *note*; in courts of law, v. 26 *note*; of Elizabeth proposed, v. 87 *note*; proceedings in, v. 376, 386; for swearing, v. 386.
- Exiles, return, v. 12, 18, 34; reconcilment, v. 36.
- FASTING in the Morwen-Pilkington controversy, v. 339.
- Fawcett, Richard, v. 166 *note*.
- Feckenham, John, Abbot of Westminster, v. 52, 53, 57, 77, 78 *note*, 85, 419-21; on the Uniformity Act, v. 70; imprisoned, v. 306.
- Felton, John, displays the Bull of Excommunication, vi. 270.
- Ferdinand, Archduke, and Elizabeth, v. 42.
- Emperor, and the imprisoned bishops, v. 421; his death, vi. 37.
- Feria, Count de, v. 41, 43, 44 *note*, 47, 56, 261.



- Finance, Committee of Council for, v. 29.
- Firstfruits, v. 29 *note*, 30, 54, 303, 333, 390; Court of, v. 54; in Ireland, v. 360; vi. 53, 97, 99.
- Fitzherbert, Sir Antony, on Royal Supremacy, v. 26 *note*.
- Fitz-Richard, Nonconformist minister, vi. 166.
- Fitzsimon, Henry, on Parker's consecration, v. 213 *note*.
- Fitzwilliams, Sir W., v. 54 *note*.
- Fleetwood, William, a Visitor, v. 129 *note*, 167, 346.
- Flowers, martyr, v. 36.
- Font rejected by Nonconformists, vi. 6.
- Foreigners, *see Immigrants*.
- Forrest, Robert, v. 12.
- Forster, Sir John, v. 140.
- Fortescue, Antony, Comptroller to Cardinal Pole, v. 30.
- Fossett, Alexander, v. 145 *note*.
- Fox, John, at Basle, v. 35; at Salisbury, v. 329; his *Book of Martyrs*, v. 326 *seq.*; and Parker, v. 353; and Elizabethan history, vi. 15; and the Osorius controversy, vi. 21, 26 *note*.
- Stephen, of Greenwich, v. 180.
- France, the Huguenots, v. 277; and the English Prayer Book, v. 292; English Huguenotic expedition, v. 365.
- Francis II., claims on England, v. 255; results of his death, v. 256.
- Dr., v. 192; imprisoned, v. 33.
- Frankfort, exiles from, v. 34, 36, 37.
- Freedom of speech under the Tudors, v. 12, 56.
- French ambassador, v. 107.
- church, Threadneedle Street, v. 269.
- Friars, Black, v. 57.
- Observants, v. 57.
- Fulk, Dr. W., Nonconformist at Cambridge, vi. 69 *seq.*; resigns, vi. 207.
- Funeral service, Eucharist at, v. 291.
- Fyton, Edward, v. 153 *note*, 154.
- GARDINER, Bishop, v. 97 *note*; in the *Book of Martyrs*, v. 328.
- Gargrave, Sir Thomas, v. 54 *note*, 129 *note*.
- Gates, Sir Henry, v. 129 *note*, 142, 148, 150.
- Geneva, exiles from, v. 34, 36.
- and the Dutch Church in London, vi. 185.
- George, Richard, released, v. 32.
- Gerrard, Sir Gilbert, and the High Commission Court, v. 157; and the Fellows of Merton, vi. 204.
- Gilby, Anthony, and the Geneva Bible, v. 330.
- Gilpin, Bernard, v. 142, 149, 150, 152.
- Godfathers, variety of usage, vi. 6.
- Godsalve, Prebendary, v. 304.
- Goldwell, Bishop, v. 4, 7, 181, 184, 428, 430; deposition against Elizabeth, vi. 252.

- Gonnorre, Mons. de, French ambassador, arrives, vi. 18.  
 Good Works, Article on, v. 398.  
 Gooderick, R., v. 22 *note*, 25, 157.  
 Goodman, Christopher, v. 37, 125; returns from exile, v. 34; on gynæocracy, v. 264; assistant of Knox, v. 330.  
 — Dean Gabriel, and sanctuary, vi. 150; and church ornaments, vi. 204.  
 Goodwin, Dr. Thomas, on tyrannicide, vi. 141.  
 "Gordon case," v. 249 *note*.  
 Gospels, *see Evangelics*.  
 Gough, J., and the *Brief Discourse*, vi. 115; sent to Bishop Horne, vi. 117.  
 Government, the Evangelics' Declaration, v. 114 *note*.  
 Grace, Article on, v. 398.  
 Gray, William, v. 151 *note*.  
 Gregory, at Hereford, v. 345.  
 Grew, Edward, released, v. 32.  
 Grey, John, v. 22.  
 Griffin, Bishop Maurice, v. 4 *note*.  
 Grindal, Bishop, v. 77, 106; returns, v. 34; elected, v. 123 *note*; and the Prayer Book, v. 125; and the High Commission Court, v. 157, 193; and the plundered sees, v. 189; consecration, v. 300; episcopal character, v. 301; and church ornaments, v. 311; vestments, v. 314; and the Geneva Bible, v. 331, 332 *note*; in Convocation, v. 387; and education, v. 424; and Bishop Bonner, vi. 29; and Nonconformity, vi. 93, 101, 113-4, 119 *seq.*, 127 *seq.*, 134, 159 *seq.*, 164, 171, 177 *seq.*; and Bullinger's letter on Conformity, vi. 120, 129, 131, 153; and seditious books, vi. 121; on state of his diocese, 1568, vi. 176; and the foreign immigrants, vi. 183, 185; elevated to the see of York, vi. 192; and Cartwright, vi. 288.  
 Gualter, and the Evangelics, v. 126, 127; and the English Nonconformists, vi. 159.  
 Gueran de Spes, Spanish ambassador, vi. 213; plots for Mary, vi. 226-7.  
 Guest, Bishop, v. 77, 168; and the Prayer Book, v. 98 *seq.*; consecration, v. 300; under Mary, v. 302; and the Articles, v. 392 *note*; and the vestiarian controversy, vi. 40; and Nonconformity, vi. 100.  
 Guildford school, v. 375.  
 Guzman, and Bishop Bonner, vi. 35; public Mass in his chapel, vi. 208.  
 HADDON, Walter, v. 169; and the High Commission Court, v. 157; and the Latin Prayer Book, v. 290; and the Nonconformists, vi. 8; at the Cambridge disputations, vi. 13, 14; and Osorius' *Epistle*, vi. 21, 23-6.  
 Hales, John, v. 22 *note*, 34.  
 Halifax, Visitation at, v. 145.  
 Hall, Richard, his deposition against Elizabeth, vi. 257.  
 — Rowland, his press, v. 329.  
 Hallingham, Nonconformist minister, vi. 177.  
 Hamstedius, Adrian, v. 267, 357.  
 Hanson, John, v. 153 *note*.

- Harding, Thomas, v. 207; deprived, v. 171; controversy with Jewel, v. 318, 320 *seq.*; and the Bull of Reconcilement, vi. 219.
- Hare, a Romanensian, vi. 180.
- Harpfield, John, v. 88, 89, 158; imprisoned, v. 33.
- Nicolas, v. 77, 78, 81, 85, 89, 158, 165, 206-7.
- Harrison, Robert, elected by the Fellows President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, vi. 203.
- William, v. 151 *note*.
- Harte, Richard, v. 153 *note*.
- Harvey, Dr. Henry, a Visitor, v. 129 *note*, 142, 148, 150, 151.
- Hats, use by clergy, vi. 50, 60, 69, 96, 101, 107.
- Havard, at Hereford, v. 345.
- Havre, expedition to, v. 365, 366.
- Hawkins, Robert, Nonconformist minister, vi. 177.
- Hayre, William, v. 151 *note*.
- Heath, Nicolas, Archbishop of York, v. 1, 5, 12, 15 *note*, 25, 42, 55, 83, 97 *note*, 116, 123 *note*, 181, 417, 418 *note*; and the coronation, v. 48, 49; on Supremacy Act, v. 65; deprived, v. 121; consecration, v. 206 *note*; imprisoned, v. 306 *seq.*
- Hell, doctrine of, v. 386, 396.
- Hell Beck, battle, vi. 245, 246 *note*.
- Henry II., obsequies at St. Paul's, v. 256.
- VIII. and the consecration of prelates, v. 216, 219, 220 *note*.
- Henshaw, Henry, his deposition against Elizabeth, vi. 255.
- Hereford diocese, Visitation 1559, v. 168; 1561, v. 345.
- Heresy, Elizabeth's avowal, v. 45; in the *Apology* controversy, v. 321 *seq.*; ascribed to Romanensians, v. 374.
- Heretics, fines of, v. 32; burned, v. 33; mutilation, v. 36.
- Hesse, Landgrave of, and Reform League, v. 260.
- Hieronymus, Italian minister, vi. 183.
- High Commission Court, v. 305; established, v. 60, 157; powers, v. 60, 64; early sessions, v. 192; character, v. 193; and fresh ordinances, v. 349; the Queen's speech, 1563, v. 369, 370; and legislation, v. 376; its obloquy, vi. 4; code of conformity, vi. 49; and the London clergy, vi. 94 *seq.*; and the press, vi. 122; and Nonconformists, vi. 166; and the Dutch Church, vi. 184; abuses, vi. 196; and the Oxford colleges, vi. 203, 204; and Cambridge University, vi. 205, 206.
- Hodgkins, Bishop, v. 202, 205; consecration, v. 238 *note*; and Parker's consecration, v. 225, 241.
- Hogmore, Mr., v. 13.
- Holgate, Antony, v. 146 *note*.
- Archbishop Robert, consecration, v. 206.
- Holland, Seth, v. 168.
- Holyman, Bishop, v. 4 *note*.
- Hollywood on Parker's consecration, v. 210 *note*, 212 *note*.
- Homilies, publication of, v. 28; Second Book issued, v. 349.
- Homily against Rebellion, vi. 247.
- Hooper, Bishop, v. 96.



- Hopton, Bishop, v. 4 *note*.  
 Horleston, John, v. 153 *note*.  
 Horne, Bishop, v. 77, 79, 81 *note*, 84, 129 *note*, 158, 169, 192; returns from exile, v. 34; consecration, v. 300; character, v. 302; and the Visitation of 1561, v. 343; and the Nonconformists, vi. 7, 101; and Bishop Bonner, vi. 29, 30, 32; question of his consecration, vi. 34; and Bullinger's letter, vi. 153; and the foreign immigrants, vi. 183; and All Souls College, Oxford, vi. 203.  
 Hosius, Archbishop, v. 428.  
 Host, elevation of the, v. 15, 16 *note*, 50, 51.  
 — John, released, v. 32.  
 Howard, Lord, of the Council, v. 25; Spanish pension, v. 44; commissioner for the Oath of Supremacy, v. 117.  
 Huddersfield, v. 145.  
 Hudson, John, v. 145 *note*.  
 Huguenots in France, v. 277; aided by Elizabeth, v. 365.  
 Huick, Thomas, a Visitor, v. 129 *note*, 158.  
 Hull, Visitation at, v. 146.  
 Humfreys, Lawrence, on reformation, v. 36.  
 Humphrey, Professor, leading Nonconformist, vi. 39, 56 *seq.*; deprived, vi. 60 *seq.*; his letter to the High Commission, vi. 61 *note*; and Bullinger, vi. 127; and the Queen, vi. 137, 141, 145; his reputation, vi. 138, 140; Nonconformist opinion of, vi. 177; at Oxford, vi. 203.  
 Hyde, Nicolas, v. 153 *note*.  
 IMAGES, Cox on, v. 53 *note*.  
 Immigrants, religion, vi. 181; settlement in London, vi. 182.  
 Imposition of hands at ordination, v. 228, 230 *note*, 231.  
 Imprisonment of Nonconformists, vi. 166-71.  
 Impropriations, v. 372, 385, 386; in Ireland, vi. 85.  
 Incontinency, punishment for, v. 386.  
 Index Expurgatorius, first promulgated, v. 332.  
 Injunctions, Elizabethan, v. 130; of Edward VI, v. 131.  
 Inns of Court, suspected papists at, vi. 207.  
 Inquisition, at Rome, v. 254, 287 *note*; in Spain, v. 278; in France, v. 279; and Spanish heretics in England, vi. 9.  
 Institutions by the Visitors, v. 144 *seq.*  
 Insurrection of the North, vi. 231 *seq.*, 244-6.  
*Intention* in Parker's consecration, v. 233 *seq.*  
 Inventories of church goods, v. 160 *note*, 162.  
 Ireland, religious alterations, v. 358 *seq.*; Parliament of 1560, v. 359, 360 *note*; Romanensians in, vi. 82 *seq.*; state of the clergy vi. 84; poverty of sees, vi. 84-5; Prayer Book in Irish, vi. 86.  
 Italian church stormed, v. 18, 19 *note*.  
 JACKSON, John, v. 153 *note*.  
 — Ralf, v. 166 *note*.  
 Jennings, Alexander, v. 146 *note*.

Jermingham, Sir H., v. 54 *note*.

Jewel, Bishop, v. 11, 12 *note*, 77; returns, v. 34; and the imprisoned bishops, v. 87 *note*; and the Prayer Book, v. 125; and Conformity, v. 126; a Visitor, v. 129 *note*, 166, 343; on vestments, v. 176; on consecration, v. 208; his consecration, v. 300; as controversialist, v. 301, 315 *seq.*, 325; and church ornaments, v. 311; and psalm-singing, v. 315; sermons, v. 315; and the *Apology*, v. 319, 387; *Defence of the Apology*, v. 320 *seq.*; and the Articles, v. 397; on tyrannicide, vi. 142; depositions concerning, vi. 258; his *View of a Seditious Bull*, vi. 275.

Jobson, Thomas, v. 153.

Jones, Bishop Hugh, consecration, v. 302.

Judges and the Supremacy Oath, v. 124 *note*.

Jugge, Richard, printer, v. 24 *note*.

Jurisdiction and Parker's consecration, v. 240 *seq.*

Justices of the peace, fresh declaration of Conformity, vi. 247.

Justification, the Evangelics' declaration, v. 110 *note*; Article on, v. 398.

KARNE [or Carne], Sir Edward, English resident in Rome, v. 250, 253.

Keilway, Robert, a Commissioner, v. 191.

Kerney, John, and Irish printing, vi. 86.

Killegrew, Sir Henry, English Envoy, v. 261.

King's College, Cambridge, Conformity, vi. 76; disorders, vi. 206; chapel, plays acted in, vi. 12, 14.

Kingsmill, Andrew, v. 129 *note*; on Nonconformity, vi. 110.

——— Thomas, his oration to the Queen, vi. 138.

Kirkbride, Barnabas, v. 151 *note*.

Kirton, Henry and Thomas, deposition against Elizabeth, vi. 258.

Kitchin, Bishop, v. 55, 116, 120, 181, 199, 202; deprived, v. 122; and Parker's consecration, v. 214 *note*; and the Articles, v. 392 *note*.

Knight, John, v. 166 *note*.

Knollys, Sir Francis, v. 34, 54 *note*, 117, 175; on the Assurance of Supremacy Bill, v. 381.

Knox, John, v. 37; on the Prayer Book, v. 102 *note*, 265; his *First Blast*, v. 264; desires to visit England, v. 264, 266; his sincerity, v. 267; and Mary, Queen of Scots, v. 276; at Cambridge, vi. 134.

LAMBARD, W., and Archbishop Parker, v. 353.

Lancaster, Archbishop, vi. 85.

Langdale, Archdeacon Alban, v. 77.

Laski, John, v. 267, 268.

Latimer, William, v. 149 *note*; in Convocation, v. 384.

Laws, reformation of, v. 53.

Lawson, Elizabeth, released, v. 33.

Lay readers, *see Readers*.

Ledbetter, Richard, v. 152 *note*.

Leicester, Earl of, and the Nonconformists, vi. 3, 59, 107-9; and the Romanensians, vi. 36.

- Leo XIII., Bull against Anglican Orders, v. 249 *note*.  
 Lesley, Bishop, vi. 180, 208, 226 ; and the Bull of Excommunication, vi. 273.  
 Lessons appointed for Sundays, v. 347.  
 Lever, Thomas, v. 37 ; returns, v. 34 ; in Convocation, v. 384 ; on the evils of the age, vi. 109 ; deprived, vi. 169 ; Nonconformist opinion of, vi. 177.  
 Leverous, Bishop, v. 359, 365.  
 Liberty, Christian, defined by the Dutch Articles, vi. 186.  
 Licenses to preach, v. 129, 133 ; vi. 51 ; *and see Preaching*.  
 Lichfield, Bishop of, *see Baines*.  
 ——— diocese, Visitation, v. 167 ; Nonconformity, vi. 77 *seq*.  
 Lights, church, v. 132.  
 Lilly, Robert, v. 153 *note*.  
 Linch, Bishop, vi. 84.  
 Lincoln, Bishop of, *see Watson*.  
 ——— diocese, Visitation, v. 167.  
 Litany, in English, v. 14, 23, 27 *note*, 28, 45, 52 ; alteration in, v. 23 ; of 1558, v. 24 *note* ; in Parliament, v. 57.  
 Llandaff, Bishop of, *see Kitchin*.  
 Loene, Peter de, v. 268.  
 ——— Walter de, v. 268.  
 Lofthouse, Archbishop, v. 363 ; vi. 84-5.  
 Lollards' Tower, St. Paul's, v. 337.  
 London, Elizabeth's entry, v. 6 ; reformers return, v. 13 ; church services in, v. 15 ; Elizabeth in, v. 46 ; *see*, temporalities, v. 96 ; and the Prayer Book, v. 106 ; Conformity, v. 127, 128 ; Visitation, v. 156, 158 *seq*. ; Dutch refugees, v. 267, 356 ; roodlofts taken down, v. 304 ; celebrations of Mass, v. 305 ; clergy, and the repair of St. Paul's, v. 333 ; clergy before the High Commission, vi. 94 *seq*. ; Nonconformity, vi. 101, 110 *seq*., 164 *seq*., 176 ; settlement of immigrants, vi. 181 *seq*. ; Bishop of, *see Bonner*.  
 Longworth, Dr. Richard, Master of St. John's College, Cambridge, vi. 69 *seq*. ; deprived, vi. 207.  
 Lords, House of, *Journal*, v. 73 *note*.  
 Lord's Supper, *see Communion*.  
 Louvainists, their activity, vi. 217.  
 Lovelace, Thomas, v. 129 *note*.  
 Lowdham, Notts, parish, v. 145 *note*.  
 Lutheran influence in England, v. 394.  
 MACGIBBON, Bishop, vi. 83.  
 Magrath, Bishop, vi. 84, 180.  
 Maidstone, prisoners at, v. 32 ; school, v. 424.  
 Mallet, Dr. Francis, in Convocation, v. 384.  
 Malton, Visitation at, v. 146.  
 Manchester, Visitation at, v. 152.  
 Mann, Dr. John, embroiled on the religious question, vi. 211 *seq*.



- Marley, Nicolas, v. 148, 149 *note*.  
 ——— Stephen, v. 148 *note*.  
 Marriage, tables of prohibited degrees, v. 348; of clergy, *see under Clergy*;  
     with deceased wife's sister, vi. 53.  
 Marsee, Thomas, v. 145 *note*.  
 Marshall, John, v. 147, 206; his *Treatise of the Cross*, v. 173; vi. 87, 88  
     *note*; on lay readers, v. 195 *note*.  
 ——— Richard, v. 159.  
 ——— Roger, v. 146 *note*.  
 Martinengo, Abbé, Papal Nuncio, v. 283, 294 *seq*.  
 Martyr, Peter, vi. 25; on the Sacrament, v. 71 *note*; and the Evangelics,  
     v. 127; on ritual, v. 174 *note*, 176, 177 *note*; and the Reform League,  
     v. 260; and the Dutch refugees, v. 357; on vestments, vi. 56 *note*.  
*Martyrology* of Fox, v. 327.  
 Mary, Queen, her ring, v. 2; funeral, v. 7–11; her religious endowments,  
     v. 29.  
 ——— Queen of Scots, her claims, v. 251, 255; and Elizabeth compared,  
     v. 276; her flight to England, vi. 223; her Conformity, vi. 225, 229;  
     plots on her behalf, vi. 226 *seq*.  
 Mason, Sir John, v. 25, 31, 32 *note*, 54 *note*, 117.  
 Mass, Queen Elizabeth at, v. 15, 50; celebration of, v. 16, 22, 28 *note*, 45,  
     50, 51; discussed at the Westminster Disputation, v. 75; order of,  
     v. 104; the term discarded, v. 134; secretly said, v. 305; at the em-  
     bassies, v. 306; of St. James, v. 335; doctrine of the Saxon Church,  
     v. 354; in Quadra's house, v. 425; private, vi. 27, 28 *note*; cele-  
     brated in London, vi. 207–9; in the North, vi. 214; in Durham  
     Cathedral, vi. 242.  
 Massingberd, Prior, v. 360.  
 Masters, W., his oration to Queen Elizabeth, vi. 11.  
 Matrimonial causes, appeals, v. 60, 252.  
 Matthew, Tobias, Archbishop, oration to the Queen, vi. 145.  
 Maximilian of Bohemia, reclaimed from Lutheranism, v. 280; and the  
     Bull of Excommunication, vi. 268.  
 May, Dean W., v. 21, 98, 169.  
 Melancthon and Barlow, v. 237.  
 Merrick, Bishop, a Visitor, v. 129 *note*, 168; consecration, v. 300, 302.  
 Merton College, Oxford, disorders at, vi. 204.  
 Mildmay, Sir Walter, v. 54 *note*, 191.  
 Minter, royal chaplain, v. 15 *note*.  
 Mitchell, Alice, released, v. 32.  
 ——— Edward, v. 151 *note*.  
 Monasteries dissolved, v. 56; re-dissolved, v. 95.  
 Monk, H., v. 151 *note*.  
 Monluc, Bishop of Valence, and the Waldenses, v. 281.  
 Monsun, George, v. 145 *note*.  
 Montague, Lord, v. 25, 68; speech on the Supremacy Bill, v. 379.  
 Montmorenci, French ambassador, v. 119.  
 More, Sir Thomas, on Roman supremacy, v. 69 *note*.

- Morette, Papal emissary, v. 283, 293.  
 Morgan, John, Bishop of St. David's, v. 181, 185 ; deprived, v. 122.  
 Morland, Christopher, v. 147 *note*.  
 Morley, Lord, v. 68 ; leaves England, vi. 272.  
 Morone, Cardinal, v. 285.  
 Morres, Robert, v. 147 *note*.  
 Morton, Dr. William, v. 153 *note*, 154 *note* ; Papal emissary, vi. 221, 222 ; his deposition against Elizabeth, vi. 254.  
 Morwen, John, v. 159 ; imprisoned, v. 33 ; controversy with Pilkington, v. 335.  
 Mountfort, Commissary, proceeded against, v. 33.  
 Mug, at Hereford, v. 345, 346.  
 Mullins, Archdeacon, his visitation, vi. 119.  
 Mundt, English Envoy, v. 260, 261, 433.  
 Murmer, William, v. 159.  
 Music in churches, v. 135, 315 (*cp. Psalm-singing*).  
 Mutilation of heretics, v. 36.  
 Mygley, Christopher, v. 146 *note*.
- NAG'S HEAD fable of Parker's consecration, v. 210 *seq.*, 340 ; vi. 81 *note*.  
 Naumburg, Protestant meetings at, v. 282, 433.  
 Neal, Dr. Thomas, and Parker's consecration, v. 210 *note*.  
 Nevinson, Dr., a Visitor, v. 129 *note*, 167.  
 New College, Oxford, Romanensians in, vi. 204.  
 Newcastle, Visitation at, v. 150, 151 *note*.  
 Newton, Walter de, v. 168.  
 Nicolson, Henry, v. 145 *note*.  
 Nonconformists, defined, vi. 2 ; prospects in 1564, vi. 3 ; their learning, vi. 7 ; leaders in 1564, vi. 39 ; the vestiarian controversy, vi. 39-42 ; and the code of 1565, vi. 57 *seq.* ; compulsion applied, vi. 89 ; deprived, vi. 97, 98, 107, 153, 156 ; literature, vi. 115 *seq.* ; seek foreign advice, vi. 126 *seq.* ; grievances, vi. 133, 156 ; and the Scotch Church, vi. 135 ; and the Elector, vi. 157 ; and foreign Evangelics, vi. 157 *seq.* ; first worship separately, vi. 165 ; imprisoned, vi. 171 ; separation, the Dutch Articles, vi. 186 *seq.*  
 Nonconformity, the Queen's letter, 1565, vi. 44 ; in ceremonial, summary, vi. 48 *note* ; in the Universities, vi. 65 *seq.* ; in Lichfield diocese, vi. 77 *seq.* ; Parker's efforts against, vi. 91 *seq.* ; in London, vi. 110 *seq.*, 164 *seq.*, 176 ; issue involved in the vestiarian controversy, vi. 124 ; the new stage of, 1570, vi. 282 ; in Cambridge, vi. 283 *seq.*  
 Norfolk, Duke of, v. 68.  
 North, Lord, v. 68.  
 Northallerton, Visitation at, v. 146.  
 Northampton, Paulet, Marquis of, v. 22, 25, 117, 129 *note*, 257.  
 Northumberland, Elizabeth's vengeance for the rebellion, vi. 238.  
 Norwich, religious refugees, v. 358 ; diocese, Visitation, v. 164 ; under Parkhurst, v. 309, 347 ; Parker's Visitation, vi. 192 *seq.* ; Parker's foundations at, vi. 195.

- Nottingham, the Visitation at, v. 143.
- Nowell, Dean, v. 37, 184; returns, v. 34; sermon at Paul's Cross, v. 314; his *Catechism*, v. 349; sermon at opening of Parliament, v. 369; prolocutor, v. 383; his *Disproof*, vi. 28; and the vestiarian controversy, vi. 41; sermon before Elizabeth, vi. 86; zeal in preaching, vi. 214.
- Robert, a Visitor, v. 129 *note*, 165.
- OATH of Supremacy, *see* *Supremacy*.
- Oglethorpe, Bishop Owen, v. 4, 15 *note*, 16 *note*, 55, 68, 77, 78 *note*, 83, 85, 181, 185; and the coronation, v. 47, 48 *note*, 50, 51 *note*; and the oath, v. 120; deprived, v. 120.
- William, v. 146 *note*.
- O'Herlichy, Bishop, vi. 83.
- O'Nial, Shane, his exploits, v. 361 *seq.*
- Operinus' press, v. 35.
- Ordinal, English, v. 63, 94, 226–233.
- Ordinances for uniformity, 1565, vi. 49.
- Ordination, v. 227, 230; discipline, v. 386.
- Ordinations under Parker, v. 303.
- Organ-playing, v. 388.
- Origen, mutilated edition of, v. 319.
- Ornaments, the Ordinances of 1565, vi. 51.
- Osorius, the *Epistle* of, account concerning, vi. 20–3.
- Otley, Yorkshire, v. 145, 146 *note*.
- Overton, Dr. William, on tyrannicide, vi. 142.
- Oxford, diocese, Visitation of 1559, v. 167; Visitation of 1561, v. 344; University, Visitation, v. 170; preaching licenses, vi. 65; the Queen's visit, vi. 136 *seq.*; enquiry of 1567, vi. 203 *seq.*
- PACE, Robert, v. 151 *note*.
- Pageants, v. 45, 46.
- Paget, Lord, Spanish pension, v. 44.
- Palatine, Count, and 'Reform League,' v. 260.
- Palls, archbishops', v. 205.
- Palmes, Dr., vi. 36 *note*.
- Papal agents in England, vi. 216 *seq.*
- Paris, Matthew, Parker's edition, v. 354.
- Parish registers, v. 133.
- Parker, Archbishop, v. 21, 98, 169, 257; account of, v. 39; made Archbishop, v. 40–1; consecration, v. 123, 199; and the Injunctions, v. 131; and the High Commission Court, v. 157; and the Chapel Royal, v. 173, 175; and Tunstall, v. 186; and the plundered sees, v. 189; and the Commission, v. 193; on lay readers, v. 195 *note*; elect of Canterbury, v. 199; Roman Catholic objections, v. 206; Nag's Head fable, v. 210; and *intention*, v. 233 *seq.*; jurisdiction, v. 240 *seq.*; his Register, v. 243–8; and Quadra, v. 297; filling of vacant sees, v. 300; and the married clergy, v. 310; and church ornaments, v. 311; and



- the Geneva Bible, v. 331, 332 *note* ; his archiepiscopal activity, v. 340, 347 *seq.* ; his metropolitanical Visitation, v. 341 ; as an antiquary, v. 352 ; Lives of the Archbishops, v. 352, 353 ; his writings, v. 353-5 ; and the religious refugees, v. 357 ; speech in Convocation, v. 383 ; character, v. 413, 414 ; and education, v. 424 ; and the French ambassador, vi. 18-20 ; and the vestiarian controversy, vi. 39-41 ; and the Nonconformists, vi. 39-46, 91 *seq.* ; unsupported by Government, vi. 51 *seq.*, 91 *seq.*, 114 ; and Sampson, vi. 59 *seq.* ; and preaching licenses, vi. 65 *seq.* ; on Cecil's policy, vi. 76 ; and Dean Nowell, vi. 87 ; his Articles of uniformity reappear, vi. 91 ; and the Nonconformists, vi. 91 ; his Articles printed, vi. 102 ; his foundations in Norwich, vi. 195 ; his homily against rebellion, vi. 247.
- Parker, Christopher, v. 151 *note*.
- Parkhurst, Bishop, v. 34 ; consecration, v. 300 ; discipline, v. 309, 347 ; and the Nonconformists, vi. 7 ; and the foreign Evangelics, vi. 131, 132 ; his laxity, vi. 192.
- Parliament, Elizabeth's first, v. 53 *seq.* ; its work, v. 94 ; second, v. 368 *seq.* ; the Queen's speech, v. 370, 374 ; question of supply, v. 374 ; legislation, v. 375 *seq.* ; meets, 1566, vi. 145 ; business, vi. 145 *seq.*
- Parpalia, Vincenzo, embassy to England, v. 283 *seq.*
- Parry, Henry, v. 129 *note*.
- Sir Thomas, v. 24, 41, 42, 117.
- Pate, Bishop, v. 4, 7, 55, 89, 96, 181, 419 ; and the oath, v. 120 ; deprived, v. 121 ; imprisoned, v. 306 ; released, vi. 81.
- Pates, Richard, a Visitor, v. 129 *note*, 168.
- Robert, v. 152 *note*.
- Patterson, Nonconformist minister, vi. 178.
- Paul IV., v. 65 ; and Elizabeth's accession, v. 250 *seq.* ; his death, v. 254.
- Paul's Cross, sermons at, v. 3, 5, 19, 106, 107, 314, 315, 334, 417 ; vi. 28 *note*, 59.
- Pearson, John, v. 147 *note*, 149 *note*.
- "Peculiars," survey of, v. 423 *note*.
- Pembroke, Earl of, v. 22, 25, 68, 117 ; Spanish pension, v. 44.
- Pensions to deprived clergy, v. 129.
- Pentland, Thomas, v. 149 *note*.
- Perambulation of parishes, vi. 6.
- Percivall, Robert, v. 153 *note*.
- Percy, Sir Henry, v. 129 *note*, 148, 150.
- Thomas, v. 142, 149 *note*, 153 *note*, 154 *note*.
- Perne, Dr. Andrew, preaches before the Queen, vi. 12.
- Perse, in Convocation, v. 384.
- Persecutions, Marian, v. 140, 152.
- Peterborough diocese, Visitation, v. 167 ; vi. 196.
- Peterhouse, Cambridge, and Nonconformity, vi. 76.
- Petre, Sir William, of the Council, v. 25, 54 *note*.
- Pettinger, Nicolas, v. 147 *note*.
- Philip II., and Elizabeth, v. 42, 44 ; and England, v. 252, 255, 261, 279, 284, 362, 374, 381, 421, 428 ; vi. 9, 211 *seq.* ; and the Augsburg Con-

- fession, v. 261; and the Inquisition, v. 278; and the excommunication of Elizabeth, vi. 267.
- Philpot, J., and the *Brief Discourse*, vi. 115; sent to Bishop Horne, vi. 117; conforms, vi. 118.
- Pilgrim, John, released, v. 32.
- Pilkington, Bishop, v. 21, 37, 98, 145, 169; returns, v. 34; and the Prayer Book, v. 125; and Conformity, v. 126; consecration, v. 301; sermons at Paul's Cross, v. 314, 334; and the Visitation of 1561, v. 343, 346; and the Morwen controversy, v. 335; protests against deprivation, vi. 107.
- Pius IV., and the Council of Trent, v. 279 *seq.*; and the Empire, v. 280; and the English Prayer Book, v. 286-91; and England, v. 287; and heretics, v. 321.
- V., his election, vi. 250; excommunicates Elizabeth, vi. 250; efforts to enforce the Bull against Elizabeth, vi. 269; and the English rebels, vi. 269.
- Plays acted in King's College Chapel, Cambridge, vi. 12, 14, 17, 18 *note*.
- Plewes, Thomas, v. 152 *note*.
- Plowden, Edmund, counsel for Bonner, vi. 33.
- Plumbers' Hall Nonconformist meeting, vi. 166.
- Pole, Cardinal, v. 181; funeral, v. 7; gifts to, v. 29 *note*, 30; his estate, v. 30; and the bishoprics, v. 47; character, v. 48 *note*, 238; and the Edwardian clergy, v. 238, 239; plot by his nephews, v. 373.
- Bishop David, v. 199, 200 *note*; deprived, v. 122.
- Pontefract, Visitation at, v. 144.
- Poor, provision for, v. 133.
- Popes, *see Paul IV., Eugenius IV., Leo XIII., Pius IV.*
- 'Porrection' in ordination, v. 227, 230, 232.
- Poynings, Sir Edward, in France, v. 365.
- Praemunire under Assurance of Supremacy Bill, v. 377.
- Prayer, attitude, v. 102; for the dead, vi. 38, 79 *note*.
- Book, compilers, v. 22 *note*; revision, v. 22 *note*, 23, 61, 63, 97; of Edward VI., v. 24 *note*; Feckenham on, v. 70-1; first use, v. 97, 106; in use, v. 124, 257; Knox on, v. 265; in Scotland, v. 266; Papal confirmation, v. 286-91; Latin, v. 289 *seq.*; in Ireland, v. 360; Welsh translation, v. 375; printed in Irish, vi. 86.
- Preachers, licensed, vi. 6; at Canterbury, vi. 47.
- Preaching, v. 17 (*cp. Paul's Cross and Sermons*); arrests for, v. 33; Parker's code of uniformity, vi. 51, 52; licenses, vi. 165 *note*; at Cambridge, vi. 65 *seq.*; regulations, vi. 79; Cartwright's proposed limitations, vi. 295.
- Precisians, vi. 2.
- Predestination, the Evangelics' Declaration on, v. 109 *note*; Article on, v. 398.
- Presbyterianism in theory and practice, vi. 192.
- Presence, doctrine of the, v. 71 *note*, 72 *note*; the Convocation protest, v. 92; the Articles on, v. 400, 402.
- Press, censorship, vi. 122.

- Preston, Thomas, at the Cambridge disputations, vi. 16, 17.  
 Prestwich, of Manchester Collegiate Church, v. 153 *note*.  
 Primer, of Elizabeth, v. 258; of 1553, v. 259; Henry's, reprinted, v. 259.  
 Priuli, Pole's executor, v. 7, 30, 31; quoted, v. 5.  
 Privy Council, on Elizabeth's accession, v. 25; Finance Committee, v. 29.  
 Processions, v. 16, 101, 106, 107, 134.  
 Proclamation to forbid preaching, v. 13-4, 19, 49 *note*; *re* Pole's estate, v. 31; concerning religion, 1570, vi. 280.  
 Proctors of the Arches, v. 31, 32 *note*.  
 Prolocutor of Province of Canterbury nominated by the Archbishop, v. 383.  
 Prophecies, Bill against, v. 375.  
 "Prophecyings" commenced at Norwich, vi. 7.  
 Propitiatory sacrifice, the Convocation protest, v. 92.  
*Proposition of the Bishops*, 1564, v. 41, 42.  
 Protestant Council proposed, v. 432.  
 ——— League, *see Reform League*.  
 ——— the word, v. 262, 338; used by Parker, vi. 92.  
 Prussia, Duke of, and 'Reform League,' v. 260.  
 Psalm-singing, v. 315, 369, 388.  
 Psalms, translation, v. 36.  
 Pulleyn, Marmaduke, v. 153 *note*.  
 Purgatory, Jewel on, v. 315.  
 Puritan, use of the word, vi. 1, 175.  
 Puritans in Cambridge, vi. 205.  
 Pursglove, Bishop, v. 145 *note*, 146.
- QUADRA, Spanish ambassador, v. 19, 43, 124, 182; and the Papal Nuncio, v. 283, 285; and Morette, v. 293; and Dudley, v. 294; and the Council, v. 294, 296 *seq.*; and the Dutch refugees, v. 356; and O'Nial, v. 362; on the Supremacy Oath, v. 412; close of his life, v. 424 *seq.*
- RAPHAEL'S tapestries, v. 49.  
 Readers, v. 194, 340.  
 Real presence, the doctrine of the Reformed Churches, vi. 135.  
 Recusants, laws against, vi. 264.  
 Redman, Thomas, v. 153 *note*, 169.  
 Reform in France, v. 277.  
 ——— League, idea revived, v. 259.  
 Reformation, official plan for, v. 20; views of exiles, v. 36; its character, vi. 5.  
 Reformed Churches, their position in 1566, vi. 135.  
 Religion, history of the word, vi. 4.  
 Religious foundations under Mary, v. 29.  
*Resolutions and Orders*, 1561, v. 349-50.  
 Reynolds, Thomas, v. 90.  
 Rich, Lord, v. 68.  
 Richardson, John, v. 151 *note*.



- Richmond, Yorkshire, Visitation, v. 152.  
 Ridley, Bishop, v. 96; on the Real Presence, v. 72 *note*; and the surplice, vi. 117.  
 Ritual, authority of the Church, v. 405.  
 Robertson, Thomas, v. 148 *note*.  
 Robinson, Robert, v. 147 *note*.  
 Rochdale school, v. 424.  
 Rochester diocese, Visitation, 1559, v. 165; Parker's Visitation, v. 343.  
 Rogers, Sir Edward, v. 24, 117.  
 Roman Catholics separate from the English Church, vi. 263.  
 Romanensians, and the Westminster Disputation, v. 74 *seq.*; their motive, v. 86; Conformity, v. 127; vi. 216, 222, 266; called heretics, v. 374; become English Roman Catholics, v. 431; vi. 262; efforts of Philip on their behalf, vi. 9; books from over seas, vi. 27; in Ireland, vi. 82 *seq.*; in the North, vi. 214 *seq.*; plots, vi. 222, 226 *seq.*; and Mary, Q. of Scots, vi. 223-5; their patriotism, vi. 264, 265; and the Bull of Excommunication, vi. 272-4.  
 Rome, English Agent there, v. 28 *note*, 29; appeal to, v. 60; supremacy, Heath on, v. 65; Scot on, v. 68; and Ireland, v. 359, 361; process against Elizabeth, vi. 251 *seq.*  
 Roodlofts taken down, v. 304; proposed restoration, v. 311.  
 Roods, removal of, vi. 79, 80.  
 Rothbury parish, diocese of Durham, v. 151 *note*.  
 Rothwood, Robert, v. 145 *note*.  
 Rouen, siege of, 1562, v. 365.  
 Royal Chapel, ornaments, vi. 37, 210-11.  
 Rudd, John, v. 149 *note*.  
 Rusworth, Jacob, v. 145 *note*.  
 Rutland, Lord, v. 30 *note*, 68.
- SABESTE, Registrar of the Bishop of Lincoln, proceeded against, v. 33.  
 Sackford and the High Commission Court, v. 157.  
 Sackville, Sir Richard, v. 25, 54 *note*, 117, 191.  
 ——— Thomas, v. 54 *note*.  
 Sacramental bread, v. 134, 136.  
 Sacrament, in Elizabeth's Prayer Book, v. 102, 103; of Order, v. 236; of the Eucharist, v. 399, 403.  
 Sacraments, administration, v. 127; the Morwen-Pilkington controversy, v. 336.  
 Sacrifice of the Mass, v. 399, 403.  
 Sacrificial priesthood, English denial of, v. 229.  
 Sadler, Sir Ralph, v. 25.  
 St. Antholin's, London, Nonconformity at, vi. 115.  
 St. Anthony's Church, London, v. 18 *note*; St. Antony's Hospital, v. 269.  
 St. Bees School, v. 424.  
 St. Giles', Cripplegate, Nonconformity at, vi. 110.  
 St. John's College, Cambridge, disorders, vi. 69 *seq.*

- St. Katherine's Hospital, London, v. 375.  
 St. Margaret Pattins, Nonconformity at, vi. 112.  
 St. Paul's Cathedral, Visitation, v. 158, 163; obsequies of Henry II., King of France, v. 256; burnt, v. 332; repair, v. 332 *seq.*; abuses, v. 337.  
 Saints' Calendar in the Latin version of the Prayer Book, v. 289-90.  
 ——— days, v. 388, 389.  
 Salebank, William, v. 161 *note*.  
 Salisbury, prisoners at, v. 32; diocese, Visitation, v. 166.  
 ——— John, Suffragan Bishop of Thetford, v. 202.  
 Salkeld, Lancelot, v. 151.  
 Salwyn, Antony, v. 148 *note*, 149 *note*.  
 ——— John, v. 129 *note*, 158.  
 Sampson, Dean Thomas, returns, v. 34; letter to Peter Martyr, v. 174; and the Geneva Bible, v. 330; leading Nonconformist, vi. 39, 56, 57 *seq.*, 169; deprived, vi. 60 *seq.*; Bullinger's opinion of him, vi. 159; Nonconformist opinion, vi. 177.  
 Sanctuary, legislation, v. 375; Bill concerning, vi. 150.  
 Sanders, Nicolas, v. 207; *De Schismate*, v. 49 *note*; on the Westminster Disputation, v. 86 *note*; his appeal to the Romanensians, vi. 217, 219.  
 Sandwich, religious refugees at, v. 357; school, v. 424.  
 Sandys, Bishop, v. 77, 78 *note*, 98, 99; returns, v. 34; and Conformity, v. 126; a Visitor, v. 129 *note*, 141, 142, 144, 148, 150-3 *note*; on vestments, v. 176; consecration, v. 300; his zeal, v. 301; and church ornaments, v. 312; in Convocation, v. 385, 389.  
 Saunders, Joan, released, v. 32.  
 Savory, Christopher, v. 13.  
 Savoy, Duke of, and the Waldenses, v. 281.  
 Saxony, Elector of, and 'Reform League,' v. 260.  
 Saye, proctor, v. 32 *note*.  
 Scambler, Bishop Edmund, v. 142, 147-9, 153 *note*, 154 *note*; consecration, v. 300; sermons, v. 314.  
 Scarrington parish, v. 145 *note*.  
 Schools, lack of, v. 371, 423.  
 Scory, Bishop, v. 77, 192, 199, 202, 205, 257; elected, v. 123 *note*; and the plundered sees, v. 189; and Parker's consecration, v. 213 *note*, 225, 240, 241; consecration, v. 238, 240; on burial ceremonies, v. 258; and vestments, v. 314; and the Visitation of 1561, v. 343, 345.  
 Scot, Cuthbert, Bishop of Chester, v. 4, 55, 67, 77, 83, 85, 88, 181, 419; on Uniformity Act, v. 71-3; and the Westminster Disputation, v. 74; on the Prayer Book, v. 103; and the oath, v. 120; deprived, v. 121.  
 Scotland, and the word 'Protestant,' v. 262; use of Prayer Book, v. 266; French veterans leave, v. 275.  
 Scudamore, at Hereford, v. 345, 346.  
 Sedgwick, Thomas, v. 148 *note*.  
 Sedition, the Evangelics' Declaration on, v. 114 *note*.  
 Seditious books seized, vi. 121 *seq.*  
 "Seditious words," cases of, v. 12.

Sees, vacant, *see Bishoprics*.

Sequestration, Parker's code of uniformity, vi. 53 ; for Nonconformity, vi. 93.

Sermons, v. 13, 17-19, 132 ; in St. Paul's, v. 89.

Service-books in All Souls College, Oxford, vi. 203 *note*.

Sewell, Hugh, v. 151 *note*, 152.

—— Richard, v. 152.

Shelley, Sir Richard, v. 164 *note*.

—— Richard (Fellow), deposition against Elizabeth, vi. 258.

—— Richard (Prior), deposition against Elizabeth, vi. 252.

Shory, John, v. 12.

Shrewsbury, Earl of, v. 25, 68, 117, 129 *note*.

Sidall, Henry, and the Visitation, v. 171.

Sidney, Sir Henry, v. 123 *note*.

Silva, Guzman de, Spanish ambassador, v. 426 ; his arrival, vi. 9, 10.

Simony in Norwich diocese, v. 193.

Sion nunnery, v. 57.

Smith, Richard, and the Visitors, v. 171.

—— Sir Thomas, v. 21, 22 *note*, 25, 54 *note*, 63, 98 ; and the High Commission Court, v. 157 ; and the *Epistle* of Osorius, vi. 26 *note*.

—— William, v. 149 *note*.

Snapp, Henry, v. 154 *note*.

Soorye, William, v. 153 *note*.

Soto, Peter de, v. 430.

Southwell, Sir Richard, v. 25.

—— Visitation at, v. 144.

Southworth, Sir John, a Romanensian, vi. 215.

Spain, *see Philip II*.

Spanish Embassy, celebrations of Mass at, vi. 208.

—— priests, v. 33.

Spark, Thomas, v. 149 *note*.

*Spirituales*, vi. 12.

Standish, Archdeacon, v. 159.

Stapleford parish, v. 145 *note*.

Stapleton, Dr. Thomas, v. 207, 304.

Stationers' Hall and seditious books, vi. 122.

Stolberg, Count, Imperial ambassador, vi. 209.

Stopes, John, v. 159.

Story, Dr. John, v. 96 *note*, 415, 419 ; and the Marian persecutions, v. 94 ; imprisoned, v. 306.

Strasburg, exiles at, v. 34, 36.

Strype, John, his historical services, vi. 39.

Stubbs, Edward, v. 145 *note*.

Succession, in the *Apology* controversy, v. 324 ; in the Morwen-Pilkington controversy, v. 340.

Suffragan bishops and consecration, v. 241.

Sugden, Christopher, v. 145 *note*.

Sunday, observation of, v. 391.



- Supremacy, the, Gooderick on, v. 26; Act of, v. 54, 58; Heath on, v. 65; Bishop Scot on, v. 67; first Commission, v. 117.  
 ——— Oath of, form, v. 60, 377; administered, v. 116 *seq.*; the Injunction concerning, v. 138; penalty, v. 181; in Parliament of 1563, v. 373; and the clergy, v. 378, 412 *seq.*  
 ——— Assurance of, Bill, v. 377.  
 "Supreme Head," the title of, v. 58-9.  
 Surplice, v. 99, 101, 309, 329; use of the, vi. 43, 47, 48, 49 *note*, 60, 71-3, 75, 89, 96, 110, 120.  
 Surrey, Visitation of 1561, v. 344.  
 Survey of the dioceses, v. 422 *seq.*  
 Sussex, Earl of, v. 68, 358; embassy to Spain, vi. 210.  
 Swearing, excommunication for, v. 386.
- TAVERHAM, John, v. 145 *note*.  
 Taxation to support clergy, v. 387.  
 Taylor, George, v. 153 *note*.  
 ——— Hamlet, v. 146 *note*.  
 ——— Thomas, v. 147 *note*.  
 Temple, the, suspected papists at, vi. 207.  
 Tenterden School, v. 424.  
 Tenths, v. 54, 55.  
 Terre, Agnes, released, v. 32.  
 Thirlby, Thomas, Bishop of Westminster, v. 4 *note*, 181, 183 *note*, 418; deprived, v. 121; imprisoned, v. 306; vi. 20.  
 Thompson, John, v. 151 *note*.  
 ——— Roger, v. 147 *note*.  
 Thonory, Bishop, vi. 84.  
 Throckmorton, Sir Nicolas, v. 2, 19 *note*, 30 *note*, 292, 296.  
 Tigurine Confession, vi. 160.  
 Tithes alienated, v. 29 *note*, 30.  
 Title, Royal, under Mary, v. 11 *note*.  
 Todd, William, v. 149 *note*.  
 Toletus, Cardinal, v. 429.  
 Towers, 'musical coalman,' author of *The Voice of God*, vi. 115.  
 Tracy, Richard, and the cross in churches, vi. 37 *note*.  
 Transubstantiation, the Convocation protest, v. 92 (*cp. Presence*).  
 Treason under the Assurance of Supremacy Bill, v. 377, 380.  
 Trent, Council of, proposed reassembling, v. 280 *seq.*; edicts, style, v. 396; proceedings, v. 426 *seq.*  
 Trinity College, Cambridge, Nonconformity, vi. 75.  
 Tudor "disease of beggary," v. 31.  
 ——— policy, v. 12, 17.  
 Tunbridge School, v. 424.  
 Tunstall, Bishop, v. 4 *note*, 49 *note*, 116, 120, 184, 185, 199, 200 *note*; deprived, v. 122.  
 Turberville, Bishop, v. 4, 55, 68, 77, 78 *note*, 181, 417, 418 *note*; deprived, v. 122; imprisoned, v. 306 *seq.*; released, vi. 81.

Turnbull, Hugh, v. 166 *note*.

Turner, Richard, v. 343.

—— William, Dean of Wells, his Nonconformity, vi. 6; deprived, vi. 107; and Bullinger, vi. 130.

Tuttyn, John, v. 148 *note*, 149 *note*.

Tyrannicide discussed before Elizabeth, vi. 141.

Tyrrell, Edmund, M.P. for Maldon, v. 54 *note*.

UNIFORMITY, Bacon on, v. 53; Acts of Edw. VI., v. 61-2; Act of 1558, v. 23, 61; Feckenham on, v. 70; Bishop Scot on, v. 71-3; its passing, v. 94; clerical opposition, v. 411; the Queen's letter, 1565, vi. 44; at Cambridge, vi. 48; Parker's code, vi. 49; and deprivation, vi. 90; Parker's code reappears, vi. 91; is printed, vi. 102.

Universities, and the Convocation protest, v. 92, 93; and the Westminster disputation, v. 93 *note*; enquiry of 1569, vi. 202 *seq.* (*cp. Oxford and Cambridge*).

Utenhovius, Joannes, v. 260, 267, 268.

VAGABONDS and the High Commission, v. 157.

Valeant, Joan, released, v. 33.

Vaux, Laurence, v. 153 *note*; Papal agent, vi. 217.

"Veil-removed oath," v. 116.

Vergerio, Paul, v. 261, 262.

Veron, and Psalm-singing, v. 315.

Vestments, v. 174-7, 386-8 (*see also Church Ornaments*); Nonconformist contentions, vi. 2; Nonconformist controversy, vi. 39-42, 60, 108 (*cp. Nonconformity, passim*); issues involved, vi. 124; Canterbury usage, vi. 47; Parker's code of uniformity, vi. 54, 56 *note*, 60; prescriptions of the Ordinances, 1565, vi. 50; Nonconformity at Cambridge, vi. 67 *seq.*; copes sold at St. John's College, vi. 71.

Villa Garcia, Friar John de, v. 170.

Visitation, royal, of 1558, Commission issued, v. 128; powers, v. 129; articles of enquiry, v. 139; procedure, v. 142; of 1561, v. 343; metropolitanical, of 1560, v. 341 *seq.*

Vitelli, Marquis, his embassy, vi. 228.

WADDESWORTH, James, on Parker's consecration, v. 213 *note*.

Waldegrave, Sir Edward, v. 306.

Waldenses in Savoy, v. 281.

Walker, Miles, v. 146 *note*.

Walsh, Bishop, v. 359, 365; vi. 86.

Walton, William, v. 145 *note*.

Ware, Robert, v. 123 *note*.

Warham, Archbishop, on consecration, v. 207.

Warmington, Dr., proctor, v. 32 *note*.

Warton, Sir Thomas, v. 306.

Watson, Bishop Thomas, v. 4, 77, 78, 81, 82, 84, 85, 184, 418-20; imprisoned, v. 87, 306 *seq.*; deprived, v. 121; sent back to the Tower, vi. 81.

- Watson, Roger, v. 148 *note*, 149.  
 ——— Thomas, v. 151 *note*.  
 Welsh translation of the Bible, v. 375.  
 Wendy, Thomas, a Visitor, v. 169.  
 Westcote, master of the choristers of St. Paul's, v. 159.  
 Westminster Abbey, dissolved, v. 57; disputation at, v. 74 *seq.*; married clergy, v. 310; sanctuary, vi. 150.  
 Westmorland, Earl of, v. 68, 346.  
 ——— Visitation of 1561, v. 344.  
 Weston, Dr. Robert, v. 4, 6; a Commissioner, v. 129 *note*, 165.  
 Wharton, Percival, v. 151 *note*.  
 White, Bishop, v. 4, 49 *note*, 52, 77, 80 *note*, 81, 85, 95, 181, 185; sermon at Queen Mary's funeral, v. 8-11; charged with sedition, v. 12; imprisoned, v. 87; deprived, v. 121.  
 ——— J., Nonconformist minister, vi. 177.  
 ——— Dr. Thomas, at Oxford, vi. 141.  
 ——— Sir Thomas, v. 185.  
 Whitehead, David, v. 21, 77, 98; returns, v. 34.  
 ——— William, v. 148 *note*.  
 Whitgift, Dr. John, and education, v. 424; and Cartwright, vi. 291 *seq.*  
 Whittingham, William, Dean of Durham, v. 34, 37, 125, 330; protest against deprivation, vi. 108 *seq.*  
 Whytbee, Thomas, v. 156 *note*.  
 Wiburn, Percival, Nonconformist agent, vi. 134, 154.  
 Willerton, John, v. 158.  
 Williams, Thomas, Speaker in 1563, v. 371.  
 Williamson, George, v. 147.  
 Willoughby, John, v. 162 *note*.  
 ——— Lord, v. 68.  
 Wilson, James, released, v. 32.  
 Winchester, unions of parishes, v. 343-4, 375.  
 ——— diocese, temporalities, v. 95; Visitation of 1559, v. 165; vi. 197; Visitation of 1561, v. 343.  
 ——— Powlet, Marquis of, v. 12, 18, 25, 68, 117; and the Dutch Church, v. 269.  
 Wirtemberg Confession and the Articles, v. 394.  
 ——— Duke of, and 'Reform League,' v. 260.  
 Wisdom, Robert, v. 156 *note*.  
 Witchcraft, legislation on, v. 375, 387.  
 Withers, George, letter from, v. 137 *note*; his license to preach, vi. 65; Nonconformist agent, vi. 134, 155 *seq.*  
 Women, at parish perambulations, vi. 6; baptism by, vi. 133, 156, 160; among Nonconformists, vi. 118, 121, 177.  
 Wood, Robert, v. 146 *note*.  
 ——— Thomas, v. 166 *note*, 178 *note*.  
 Worcester, Bishop of, *see Pate*; temporalities, v. 96; diocese, Visitation, v. 168.  
 Worms, exiles at, v. 36.



- Wotton, Dr. Nicolas, at, v. 5, 44, 118, 147 *note*, 165 ; and church ornaments, vi. 205.
- Wray, Christopher (afterwards Chief Justice), counsel for Bonner, vi. 33.
- Writ *De Excommunicato capiendo*, v. 376, 386, 391.
- Wroth, Sir Thomas, v. 34, 54 *note*.
- Wye school, v. 424.
- YATES, John, v. 151 *note*.
- Yokeshall, William, v. 147.
- York, Visitation at, v. 146, 147 *note* ; diocese, absentees from Visitation, v. 155 *note*.
- Young, Elizabeth, released, v. 32.
- Thomas, Bishop of St. David's, afterwards Archbishop of York, a Visitor, v. 129 *note*, 168 ; consecration, v. 300, 302.
- ZURICH archives, v. 34 *note*.

OXFORD  
PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS  
BY HORACE HART, M.A.  
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

BX  
5055  
D48  
1884  
V.6  
C.1  
ROBA



